National Anti-Slavery Standard.

VOL. XXVI. NO. 29. NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1865. WHOLE NO. 1,329.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

PUBLISHED WEEKLY, ON SATURDAY,

AT $3.00 PER ANNUM,

BY THE

AMERICAN ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

At its Office, No. 48 Beekman Street, New York

AND AT THE OFFICE OF THE

PENNSYLVANIA ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY,

5 *South Fifth Street, Philadelphia.*

LETTERS should be addressed to *Editor of The National Anti-Slavery Standard*, 48 Beekman st., New York.

ADVERTISEMENTS, 10 cents per line each insertion.

Pro-Slavery.

In this Department we give place to such extracts from the Pro-Slavery Press, North and South, as serve best to illustrate the character of Slavery and the spirit of its champions and apologists.

THE FEELING WITH WHICH THE SOUTH REGISTERS THE PRESIDENT'S DECREES.

Charleston Daily News, Nov. 11.

THE communications published this morning, between the Provisional Governor of our State and the President, upon the subject of our State war debt and the Congressional Amendment, inspire a feeling of profound regret. It is the honest purpose of the people of this State to accept the situation, and to that end they have industriously adopted every measure that seemed to be implied in such acceptance. No unbecoming feeling has been entertained, no preconception or sentiment of wrong or disappointment has been permitted to affect our course. There were certain features of our Constitution supposed to be objectionable to the Government—they have been removed; there were certain men not the most popular with us, but supposed to be agreeable to the Government—they have been elected; the institution of domestic slavery—dear to us from conviction of its fitness, and the fact that it had grown into our experience and structure of our society—has been eradicated; the burdens of the Government assumed in the process of our subjugation, we have undertaken to share; the cultivation of our lands and leading staples—necessary to the commerce of our common country—we have prepared to prosecute with whatever might be possible of vigor and success. This may have been involuntary, occasioned as much by a sense of interest or necessity as of moral obligation, and gives us, therefore, no special claim to merit, but must serve to show that if there be measures we are unwilling to adopt, they are those to which we feel there justly are exceptions.

Of these are those mentioned in this correspondence. We were unwilling to repudiate the war debt for the reason that it seemed unnecessary to the restoration of the Union; that the debt was inconsiderable, and that to its extent it constituted the capital of many people who had no concern in the war; merchants—many of them owing debts they could not pay—but their assets in this form to them for their creditors; widows and guardians, diffident of all other forms of available security, still trusted to the State. With a sense that the requisition to repudiate this debt was gratuitous, and unwilling to incur the shame which, under any circumstances, we still must feel in such repudiation, *we were solicitous to avoid it.*

So, also, with the Constitutional Amendment. So far as that involves the fall of slavery, we have no repugnance to it; that fall is now a fact accomplished, and there would be no reluctance to any further measure to make that fact more perfect or irrevocable; but there is reluctance to admit Congressional legislation within the States. If admitted to determine the condition or relations of the negro, it would be admitted to determine them to the ruin of our people, if that should be agreeable to the majority; or admitted to those questions, it would be in for any other that might arise; the Congress would supercede the State Legislature—the theory of our Government would be broken; and while, therefore, we might question as to the consequences to our own domestic interests, we could not question the consequences to the Republic, and if unbecoming to be influenced by considerations of the one, it was justly proper to be respectful of the other.

For these reasons, these measures were objectionable; but we are now instructed that they are necessary; and there is, perhaps, a common feeling that further effort is useless, and that it is better to submit passively to what fortune yet awaits us, than become the instruments of our further degradation; but this information comes from the President in terms to imply his profound conviction of its truth. It is not to be supposed he would require unnecessary abasement to power; not to be supposed that he would seek to increase the power of Congress, by admitting it within the State, which is now his antagonist, and threatens him with all the agencies it now commands. He calls upon us to trust him. Our course is unquestionably the same. If we cannot trust the President there is certainly no other power within the Government we can trust. Apart from him, there surely seems no other refuge. Between the entering into Congress, even under these circumstances, and continuing as a military department there is still some room for choice. The President is certainly in a condition to state the terms upon which he may conceive himself sufficient to effect such entrance; and while, therefore, we may lament the necessity, it does not seem that we have any option but to accept it.

Nor are the responsibilities upon us, or upon us alone. If forced to repudiate our debts, we escape, at least, the moral turpitude of such an act, and if we concur in such a course as breaks the integrity of the Government and leaves this State and others in absolute and powerless submission to the volition of Congress, or the creature of the masters of Congress, there are other States to share it with ourselves, and those erecting the guillotine are not necessarily the last to feel the edge of it.

Nor with respect to the Congressional amendment can it matter in result, whether we do or do not accept it. The majority necessary to its adoption has already been acquired in New Jersey; but two more States are needed—these will come from the Northwest, if not from the Southern States to be readmitted. The amendment, therefore is a fact accomplished. Our protest cannot arrest it; and, inasmuch as we have no vantage ground to stand on—nothing upon which to stipulate—it were best, perhaps, to meet our task with frankness, and in that contest which seems to be impending, and upon which the fate of this land seems finally at stake, it were wise, perhaps, at once to strengthen the hands of the Executive by whatever of concessions may be necessary to a favorable issue.

THE RIGHTS OF THE SOUTH.

From the Jackson (Miss.) News.

IT is urged by some of the "blues," that the war destroyed the rights of the States, and that we have no rights, and must be content with what we can get. We respectfully dissent from such absurd doctrines, and point to the President as one man, at least, who believes nothing of the kind. If we are to be guided by the opinions of some of our cotemporaries even in Mississippi, we must abandon the grand principle upon which this Government was founded, and yield at once to the extreme Federal idea of consolidation. The great institution of slavery has been destroyed. It received a dreadful blow, in our judgment, in 1857, when the Missouri Compromise was repealed; the dogs of war were even then let loose, and we all now bow in acknowledgment of an accomplished, and, perhaps, inevitable fact. But the rights of the people were involved only to a limited extent in the institution of slavery, and may be resolved into the simple right of holding property in slaves. That right has been forced from us by the result of the war, and we have acquiesced in the demand of the North as a peace offering for all time to come. It matters not to us whether we live under an acknowledged extreme central despotism or of a Government said to be limited in its powers and of Constitutional guarantees, but really as despotic as the other.

Some will have us to sacrifice right after right without a murmur, that we may be great and prosperous (?) in the future. They will bind themselves in chains, in order that they may hereafter enjoy freedom. It is a dangerous experiment—a fatal delusion.

"Fame to our ashes comes, alas, too late!
And praise smells rank upon the coffin plate!"

We have only to stand firm now, and even submit, for the time being, to a state of vassalage, rather than yield any right that has not been clearly sacrificed by the war. We contend that nothing of our Constitutional rights has been lost save the right of property in slaves; and we regard all politicians who are now persuading the people that they must still yield more, as dangerous counselors, who will take away the very life blood of liberty, presenting as with a semblance

"Cold as insensate marble."

Some of the panic makers contend that President Johnson has made further demands—that we must yield to his wishes if we hope to have a voice in the Government. We have repeatedly shown that President Johnson has made no demand that was not enunciated in his proclamation; and were he now to make a thousand demands unauthorized by the Constitution, we would still advise the people to give no official sanction to his requirements. President Johnson has announced to European governments that the rebellion is at an end; that the war has ceased, and he will not be sustained, either North or South, if he should now attempt any infringement upon rights that have been restored by the close of the war. To take any other view of the subject, is to declare that the United States Government does not exist; that the rights of freemen are all sacrificed, and that we have a Dictator at Washington instead of a Constitutional President. If a Dictator inimical to us, and with power to back him, we have nothing to hope for; if a President, guided by the Constitution, we have nothing to fear. Therefore, in our acts, let us look to the "public welfare," and set aside the "blue ruin" politicians, who use us the *in terrorum* style of arguments to accomplish their designs.

From the N. Y. Daily News.

PSHAW!—A Radical cotemporary exulting in a promise of Massachusetts to erect a statue in honor to Col. R. G. Shaw, tells its readers that the statue will "remind young men that the best they can do for their country is the best they can do for *the* race"—meaning the negro race, of course; for, that is the race which our cotemporary runs in, although not of it. It then demands of Pennsylvania a like tribute to Col. Dahlgren, very consistently. The Colonel in question proposed to subject the white families of the South to fire and faggot, provided only the black families could be benefited according to his ideas of humanity.

Selections.

AN HOUR WITH ANDREW JOHNSON.

Editorial Correspondence of the Franklin Repository.

[The following is understood to be from the pen of the Hon. A. K. McClure:]

I WAS of those, in an humble way, who fashioned Andrew Johnson into a Vice-President at Baltimore—having publicly supported his nomination before the meeting of the Convention and voted for him in that body. I have since then had occasion to complain of my own work, and have never, after the inauguration, been free from grave apprehensions as to the wisdom of that choice. Differing with most men who besiege the Executive department in this very important particular, that the Administration has no honors I aspire to, I may differ with most of them also alike in the frankness with which I counsel, when invited to do so, and in the convictions which result from contact with rulers.

I found myself here on Friday, for the first time since February last; and during the afternoon of the same day called at the White House to see President Johnson. I found the halls, the ante-chambers, and all other available spaces around the Executive room, crowded with a motley mass of men, with an anxious female face here and there, giving variety to the scene—all waiting, and some from day to day, to gain an interview with the President and plead for restoration of citizenship and property. Soon the door opened, and a genteel lady emerged from the President's room, with a large official envelope clutched nervously in her hand, and a benignity of countenance that told more plainly than words that another citizen had been born again to the Republic. Soon after, another and then another came with the trophies of success, and as each one passed out the mass would sway toward the door to catch the name of the next one called. In a little time I gained admission and had my first interview with Andrew Johnson as President.

There are few men who could make a more favorable impression upon a stranger on first acquaintance, than the President. He differs from Mr. Lincoln in most external characteristics, and in many contrasts favorably. He lacks Mr. Lincoln's jolly humor; improves upon his ungainly ways; is vastly more diplomatic, and wears a uniform and quiet dignity that would have been shockingly out of place in his lamented predecessor, but which well becomes the Chief Executive of a great nation. He is about five feet ten in height, rather stoutly and symmetrically built, has long hair well silvered by the frosts of time, rather a cold, grey eye, that looks as if in its calmest glances there slumbers behind it quite enough to quicken it; a finely-chiselled Roman face, usually sad in expression, at times relieved by a genial smile, and in manner and dress serenely plain and unaffected. Such is, in brief, a portrait of Andrew Johnson, but two years ago the despised, the reviled of traitors; the man upon whose head their fiercest denunciations, and against whom were hurled their keenest and deadliest shafts, and now the President of the United States, with his foes at his feet supplicating his pardon, and charged with the highest duties and responsibilities ever imposed upon mortal man.

He meets the visitor cordially, and speaks in the softest tone and in well measured sentences. There was little formality—the usual greetings and thence we passed to questions of graver moment. However reticent he may be on some issues, he seems to have no reserve as to the policy he conceives to be the true one to bring back the insurgent States. He discussed the position of those States and their people with great interest and occasional warmth, and with a frankness that left no doubt as to his purpose. He holds that they were never out of the Union; that secession, however accomplished as a fact, cannot be accomplished in law; that the supreme authority of the Government in those States was not overthrown by rebellion, but simply in abeyance, and of course it logically follows his premises that, since rebellion has ceased, the States resume their proper place in the Union and restoration is accomplished. This, in brief, was the standpoint from which the President discussed the question of reconstruction for more than an hour, and answered suggestive objections at times with an earnestness that demonstrated how ardently he is working to give success to his policy. I could not but remind him that his theory stripped all traitors of the protection they might claim as public enemies; that it would stamp as guilty of treason within the law, every man who aided the rebellion, and of necessity demand at his hands commensurate punishment for what he must hold as unmitigated crime—as appalling murder and desolation for which there is no extenuation to be plead. "You have," I added, "given us on every hand the nation's monuments of Mercy—where will be its monuments of Justice? Davis is a proclaimed assassin, as well as traitor—his agents have died, another (Wirz) will follow—how are the principals to atone to a people doubly bereaved in their homes and in their chief sanctuary of power?" To this the President answered with much animation that the measure of, and the time for, atonement were yet for the future to determine. I shall not soon forget the emphasis with which he declared that the South must come back and be a part of us, and "it must come," he added, "with all its manhood—I don't want it to come eviscerated of its manhood!" To this proposition abstractly there could be no objection made. We want the South with all its manhood, which I would conceive to be the Southern people with their treason abandoned and their crimes punished—not punished revengefully; not in imitation of the Guillotine of France or the Inquisition of Spain; but by making the leaders who conspired to overthrow the Government, strangers to its honors and its citizenship and thus through life the monuments of the power, the justice and the magnanimity of the mightiest nation of the earth. The President said that such *may* be the measure of punishment; that he had pardoned but few who would come under such a rule; that there are exceptions to all rules, and there were both civil functionaries and army officers who might be pardoned with propriety. He said that he had not yet gone as far in his amnesty, either general or special, as Mr. Lincoln proposed. He explained what is not generally known, that his pardons are mainly of business men, many of whom were Union men, who must have pardons to enable them to sell or mortgage their lands, or to get credit in their business operations; and added that he had not yet reached the consideration of such cases as Lee, Stephens, Longstreet, Beauregard and others of that class.

He spoke freely of the proposed trial of Davis, and said that as yet the Government had not taken any steps in the matter. If he is to be tried in Richmond, the trial must necessarily be postponed until the civil authority is fully restored, and then it will be a question for consideration under the condition of affairs which may at that time exist. As Virginia is still practically under martial law, certainly wholly under military rule, I judge that many moons may wax and wane before we can have a great State trial. I do not question the wisdom of this delay, for it is certainly better for the Government to avoid the danger of defeat in attempting to convict of constructive treason in Washington, than to force a trial which might afford a technical escape for Davis and leave the great questions undetermined. If I were going to guess on the subject, I would say that Davis is more likely to be paroled during the next year than to be tried, and if he is ever hanged, he must do it himself.

The President is clearly adverse to confiscation and that question is practically settled. Whatever might be the views of Congress, confiscation is not possible with an Executive determinedly hostile to it and with the pardoning power in his hands. I infer, however, that on this point Congress will harmonize with the Executive, as a number of even the Radical leaders, such as Greeley and Sumner, openly oppose it. If our credit can be sustained otherwise I am content. Five years hence we shall all be wiser on that point than now.

I believe that the President will wield all his power to effect the admission of the representatives of the rebellious States into Congress during the next session. The Senate being organized the question cannot come up there until it is brought up in order; but there will be a strong pressure to force the admission of the Southern members by placing their names on the roll when the House meets. This Mr. McPherson will not do, and on all votes of instructions he will call only those who are returned from States clearly entitled to representation. The law forbids him to do otherwise, and he will be faithful to it. The question of their admission will then agitate the House, and I fear make a sad breach between the President and Congress. The South is encouraged by the position of the Administration to be importunate in its demand for admission, and it is not improbable that it will in the end be admitted. I have seldom seen Congress struggle against power and hold out to the end. The history of such conflicts is always dotted with frail ones who fall by the way. I have ever felt that the revolted States should take no part in the Government they vainly sought to destroy until all issues arising from the war, and all its logical results, should be settled by faithful men. To the victors, not to the vanquished—to the friends, not to the foes of the Government does this duty belong, and if it shall be otherwise, there are many who will tremble for the safety of the Republic.

On the future of the freedmen the President talks well. He displays more sense than sentiment on the question, and means to solve the problem fairly as demanded by civilization and humanity. Of their ability to win a position that will enable them to be incorporated into our system of Government as citizens, he is not eminently hopeful, but feels that it must be fairly tried with an open field for the negro. That failing, he looks upon colonization as the only alternative.

It would be foolish to disguise the fact that the President, by word and deed, disclaims the position of a partizan Executive, and that he is not insensible to the flattering approval of his Administration by the Democratic party. I do not mean by this that he is in sympathy and fellowship with them; but I do mean that he is not wholly in sympathy against them; and he will, I feel warranted in saying, adhere to the political fortunes of the Southern States without regard to political consequences. This may or may not sever him from the party that sustained and cherished him in the darkest days through which he passed, and that won him the highest honors of the Nation through a flood of obloquy; but it if it does, I infer that he will accept the situation. He evidently means above all other things, to compass the admission of the Southern members and the complete restoration to power of those States, and if Massachusetts and South Carolina can strike hands over the same Administration, then will we have a faithful President and harmonious country. If not—I leave the future to tell the story. Where in all this record soon to be made up the Nation shall see that "treason is the greatest of crimes and must be punished," is not to my mind apparent. A. K. M.

"WILL THE NIGGER WORK?"

From the Bristol (Eng.) Press.

THE events of the last few months have led to this question being asked again and again, both in America and in Europe, and it has been answered often without the slightest knowledge of the real capacity of the negro. It is, in fact, doing no injustice to European society to say that the general impression is that he will not work if he can possibly get anybody to supply him with food without any exertion on his own part. This fallacy is the subject of a very interesting letter, which has just been published by Mr. Wilson Armistead, of Leeds, a Friend who has taken great interest in the movements that have been set on foot in this country to ameliorate the condition of the liberated negroes. In this document several reliable authorities are quoted to show that under fair conditions the negro is not only willing to work, but that he has all the natural ability to make him a skilled workman. To those who really know the negro, and who have not got their ideas of the disposition of the formerly enslaved race from second-hand sources, it is quite unnecessary to urge this view; but as the majority of Europeans must necessarily be guided by the statements of other people, and as it is unquestionable that very absurd notions are in consequence entertained on the subject, Mr. Armistead is doing a good service to the negro by the publication of the opinions of persons who have seen him work, and who know exactly what are his sympathies, his aspirations, and his capacity. Love of property is inherent in the human race, and this passion has been strikingly manifested in the negro, even during the years of his captivity. On many estates the slaves were permitted to keep fowls, and to use the profits for their own purposes; and the way in which the negroes managed this business showed an aptitude for commerce which often astonished Europeans who visited the South. Another way in which the negro has shown his desire to acquire property is in regard to the matter of personal dress. The negro is almost luxurious in his dress, and this is a disposition seldom associated with absolute idleness. That there are individual negroes who are not fond of work may be admitted, but the same can be said of the best races of Europeans. The lazzaroni of Naples, indeed, display the pauper spirit more distinctly than the negroes, notwithstanding the fact that the latter have been depressed by ages of the vilest treatment. Education has been kept from them, and all the higher qualities of the mind have been discouraged. On the slave plantation it was all work and no pay and no liberty; is it astonishing that with such rewards the negro should become disgusted with the work which was all done for the profit of "massa." In freedom he is a different being. The world is open to him. Business is open to him. He may buy and sell, and whatever profit he makes is his own. In short, with Liberty he has acquired not only the prerogatives but the desires of free men. Let him have the chance, and he will be well able to take care of himself. In the meantime he needs a helping hand, and there are few who will refuse to give it, for even those who have allowed half-informed people to persuade them that the negro will not work will admit that he has never yet been placed in circumstances in which his capacity was fairly tried, and his true nature allowed to disclose itself. The suddenness with which he has acquired his liberty is a sufficient excuse for his anxiety to show, by seeking new fields for his labor, that he is a free man. At such a period there cannot fail to be some confusion and considerable suffering, but by and by the negro will settle down to work, and then will be time for those who doubt to correct their opinions as to his alleged repugnance to labor.

FIRST FRUITS OF RECONSTRUCTION.

From the N. Y. Tribune.

WE can best understand the success of the experiment of reconstruction by looking at the results in many of the Southern States. It is six months since the President threw open the doors of the Union to the defeated rebels, and invited all who were willing to become good citizens and obedient to the laws to enter and resume their seats at the old family board. History does not present an example of similar magnanimity. Men speak of the merciful revolution of William III., forgetting that William sent Fenwick to the scaffold, and bestowed the choicest estates of the Jacobites upon his supporters and favorites. We have punished no one for treason. Jefferson Davis was arrested for conspiring to commit murder, and, as that charge has never been abandoned, we presume it is as a "murderer" he is now at Fortress Monroe. Clement C. Clay was imprisoned on the same charge. The men executed were executed as murderers. Wirz died as one guilty of murder. All the confiscated lands have not quite been restored, but the pardon that embraces Tredegar Anderson will soon envelope in its consoling folds every remaining rebel.

Those who have criticized that policy certainly admit that the President's motives were kind and charitable. Perhaps we can no better illustrate that kindness than by remembering that to gratify the South he was willing to postpone justice to the negro. Those who know how deeply and earnestly the honest Northern heart felt on this subject will appreciate the sacrifice that the President was willing to make to propitiate the South. If any statesman commanded their gratitude, their support, their undeviating kindness, it was the President. They made protestations. They were the President's most sincere friends. They would show him the true devotion of a Southern heart. He was their bulwark against Radicalism. He would stand between them and "Abolition ghouls." They, on their part, would be his most devoted supporters. They would take up arms for him as they took up arms against him, and under the fostering care of Andrew Johnson, poor white, but now President of all these States, they would assist in building up a Republic that would rival in imperial grandeur the proudest days of the Commonwealth of Rome.

Well, we have tried them, and what? Let us go down to Louisiana. Here is a State rich in resources—her great metropolis overflowing with the good things that commerce can bring. This peace gave its people, and how have they answered it? In the first place we have a Governor like Wells, an accident of the war, who took advantage of the peace to hold his place by pandering to the worst rebel feelings. We find the negro down-trodden. Men are imprisoned for speaking their opinions about negro suffrage. The worst features of the slave laws are revived, and a large party is, with difficulty, dissuaded—dissuaded, let us own it—by such men as Beauregard and Hays from going to Mexico and bringing the runaway rebel Allen back as Governor. The good results of former administrations are wiped away in an instant, and the rebels, headed by military popinjays like Fullerton, are rapidly rushing their State back to the terror and gloom of the ante-rebellion period. If we go into Mississippi, we find not only a refusal to allow the negroes the rights of jurors, but even the rights of witnesses. In South Carolina, the rebels almost force Wade Hampton into the Gubernatorial chair, merely because such action would be a defiance to the President. As for the rebel debt, she will pay her share, this rebellious Carolina, dollar for dollar. As for the Constitutional Amendment, it comes by compulsion. South Carolina will vote for it now, that she may kick open the doors of Congress and stand before the Speaker's chair with six electoral votes in her hand—six votes, to our shame be it spoken, that represent a power as great as Connecticut, with eighty thousand white men less. Then we come to North Carolina, and find Jonathan Worth elected Governor because Holden was the choice of the President. Not one word about the Constitutional Amendment. As with these States it is everywhere throughout the South. What one State has come back frankly, and accepted all the issues of the war, even the issues of the President? For the temporary purpose of an argument, we will lay aside manhood suffrage. What Southern State has accepted all the Presidential propositions? Not one; and for this reason only that the rebels will not concede one jot or tittle toward reconstructing a Union that does not eternize slavery and strengthen the power of the slaveholders. They know full well that if we leave the negro in their hands a freed man, and allow them to group around him laws as degrading as those of South Carolina, they will have little trouble in perpetuating a system more degrading than slavery—in this, that it gives the master power over the negro, and at the same time releases him from any pecuniary or personal responsibility.

Let us emphasize these two points. The rebels play for a winning game. "Let us," they say, "kick open the doors of Congress, and what then? We have our apportionment increased; for, the negro being free, he must be counted man for man. At home, we have negro labor at slave prices, and no responsibility. We may turn the negro out to the commons when he is seventy, just as we turn out horses. Our laws compel him to work for us—we may do as we please with him. The Government has released us from our obligation to the negro, and placed an obligation upon him. Altogether we have made a jolly exchange and trumped the Yankees in their own game." These gentlemen of the South mean to win. They meant it in 1861 when they opened fire on Sumter. They meant it in 1865 when they sent a bullet through the brain of Abraham Lincoln. They mean it now. The moment we remove the iron hand from the rebels' throats they will rise and attempt the mastery. If South Carolina adopts the Amendment, she does it under compulsion—the compulsion of a dispatch from Washington. South Carolina can well afford to adopt the Amendment when she is permitted to re-enact the Slave Code. The power that compels this action on her part is the power that could have compelled her to grant manhood suffrage six months ago. The danger of our reconstruction is that we trifle with our own power—that, instead of waiting until the prodigal really comes home, we send the fatted calf to him. We do not give the true men of the South a chance. If with all our power we permit such men as Durant in Louisiana, Hamilton of Texas, and even the conservative Holden in North Carolina, to be overslaughed and beaten by returned rebels, how can we expect Durants and Hamiltons and Holdens to rise up in the South? When Union men find they can only rise by eating rebel dirt, we shall have a crop of Wells politicians over the South living on this unsavory diet. Therefore, we not only break faith with the negro, but with the true Union men—with those who went into the caves with Andrew Johnson, and with him suffered for their principles. The first fruits of reconstruction promise a most deplorable harvest, and the sooner we gather the tares, plow the ground again, and sow new seed, the better.

THE MONUMENTAL CATHEDRAL.—The Nashville *Times* says: Rev. J. W. Rogers, of Memphis, is still collecting funds to build a grand cathedral "in honor of the Confederate dead." Mr. Rogers says:

The name of every Southern patriot, whether he fell in battle or died since the war commenced, will be inscribed—citizen or soldier.

We presume that if this business goes much further there will be a military interference to stop it. But what honor shall be paid, what monumental cathedral be builded, in memory of the thousands of Tennesseans who nobly gave their lives for the Union? Are they, only, of all the dead, to sleep unhonored and forgotten? Shall our Legislature take no steps to give an honorable perpetuation to their names and deeds in behalf of their country? Had the rebellion triumphed a splendid record of its heroes would have been given by the State of Tennessee. Let us show our love for the memory of our defenders, and for their surviving comrades, by rescuing the names of the loyal soldiers of Tennessee from oblivion.

HAVANA.

Correspondence of N. Y. Tribune.

RELEASE OF ARGUELLES—HE URGES EMANCIPATION OF THE BLACKS—HE WILL LEAVE HAVANA FOR NEW YORK NEXT MONTH.

HAVANA, Nov. 8, 1865.

THE captivity of Arguelles, which will remain as one of the most afflicting examples of arbitrary power in this age, is drawing to a close. The doors of the prison in which he has lingered for the last sixteen months, by the combined act of our Government and of the Captain-General of Cuba, are about to be thrown open. The Spanish government, who never applied to Washington for his rendition, and never participated in his imprisonment, has at last ordered that Arguelles should be released. Mr. Lersundi, the newly-appointed Captain-General of Cuba, who is to leave Madrid on the 15th of this month, brings with him the order which is to set him at liberty. He will avail himself of it to come to New York, where he will unfurl the banner for the emancipation of the blacks in Cuba, supported in his noble task by the whole population of the Creoles of the Island, who have selected him as their leader.

To explain to you the cause of this flattering distinction, it is necessary that you should know that Arguelles, in an eloquent petition to the Queen of Spain, has denounced to her Majesty the guilty manœuvres of the slave-traders of Cuba, who, under the hypocritical mask of enemies of the trade, have recently asserted in presence of the crown that for a long time past "the shores of Cuba had not witnessed such an immoral traffic." With courage and independence Arguelles wrests the mask from the faces of these faithless scoundrels and shows to the Queen that there are several cases of slave-traders actually pending before the tribunals of the island; that men have been imprisoned and banished on that account, and that himself, having tried to oppose their traffic and to denounce it to the civilized world, was a victim of the powerful coalition the dealers in human flesh in Cuba—assisted and supported by the present Captain-General of Cuba, Gen. Dulce—had formed in view of the successful pursuit of their illicit trade.

Arguelles, who has been a member of the Spanish Cortez, and who is consequently conversant with the politics of his country, and with the sad condition of the Spanish colonies, whose wants his long residence in Cuba has enabled him to study, will, no doubt, prove to be a most efficient advocate of the Creole population of the Island. Once in New York, he will employ his talents for the deliverance of an oppressed race, and to the furtherance of the true interests of the white population of Cuba, who for years and years have been clamoring in vain for administrative reforms and the emancipation of the blacks.

The petition of Arguelles to the Queen of Spain has been published in several Spanish papers, and his views have found echo in the heart of the grandees of Spain, to whom he belongs by birth and sentiments. The *Democratic* of Madrid, speaking of this document, says:

"The slave-traders, in their petition to the Queen, have no fears to demonstrate that the condition of Cuba cannot be bettered, and to assert that there is no slave trade in Cuba. An unfortunate, whose misfortune is due to his having captured by authority an expedition of 1,050 negroes, a victim of the power of the scoundrelly merchants of human flesh—Mr. Don *Jose Augustin Arguelles*—has taken upon himself the task to give the lie to their assertions. But of what avail will his efforts be? The slave-traders will triumph. The cause which they defend is odious, but it finds sympathy in those places where it is important for them to find it."

I am happy to say that the accusations of the *Democratia* are unfounded. Gen. O'Donnell has resolved to abolish the slave trade in Cuba, and he is now taking energetic measures to that effect. Gen. Lersundi, the newly appointed Governor of Cuba, has received special instructions by which the slave trade, it is hoped, will receive the death-blow.

[To the above from the *Tribune*, the *Commercial Advertiser* of the 17th inst. appends the following:]

This tells the whole story, and places Mr. Seward in the very undesirable position of the tool of a slave-trading Captain-General, and a co-operator with the most infamous men in Cuba. His characteristic astuteness forsook him when he thought to propitiate Spain by an unnecessary and wanton outrage upon an unoffending foreigner. Arguelles, after his release, will come to this country for the purpose of operating in behalf of emancipation in Cuba. Dulce is to be superseded by Gen Lersundi, who has received instructions to suppress the slave trade, and who, it is to be hoped, will introduce a new order of things in Cuba. Arguelles, who is called by the Madrid *Democratia*, "a victim of the power of the scoundrelly merchants of human flesh," will be welcome here. We wonder how Mr. Seward relishes association with those by whom Arguelles was made a "victim."

LETTER FROM JOHN BRIGHT.

SOME time since, says the Madison (Wis.) *Journal*, Adj.-Gen. Gaylord, of this State, forwarded a copy of his annual report, accompanied by a letter to Hon. John Bright, the famous leader of the Liberal party in England, and the true and outspoken friend of the United States during the darkest period of our fortunes, when our friends across the Atlantic were few, and, for the most part, timid.

In reply, Gen. Gaylord has received the subjoined characteristic note from Mr. Bright:

"ROCHDALE, Oct. 19, 1865.

"DEAR SIR: I write to thank you for sending me the volume to which your letter refers.

"I thank you, also, for the kind expressions in your letter. Your war has ended, as I always hoped and believed it would end, in the overthrow of slavery and the restoration of the Union.

"I fear, however, that unless the President adopts a firmer tone with the South, the negro will have a hard time of it, if left to the small mercy of his former owners.

"It will be a grievous thing, if, after fighting for the integrity and freedom of your country, you shall fail to deal honestly and justly with the black population, so long suffering in your midst.

"I have had great faith in you, and will not now abandon it.

"Liberty, all the world over, owes much to you, and I will not believe now that color will be permitted to shut out several millions of your population from the full rights of freedom.

"Your State has done its share in the great work which will make the last four years forever famous in the history of your great nation.

"With many thanks for your kind letter, I am, very truly, yours, JOHN BRIGHT.

"AUG. GAYLORD, Esq., Adj.-Gen., Madison, Wis."

ALABAMA POLICEMEN.—A letter to the Chicago *Tribune*, dated at Montgomery, Alabama, November 6th, says:

"Colonel Gayle, of Cahawba, who offered a million dollars for the assassination of Mr. Lincoln, has not been pardoned. He was released from the Old Capitol prison and sent here to report to the Hon. J. Q. Smith, United States District Attorney, who bound him over in the sum of $25,000 to appear at the next term of the United States Court, which is to be holden on the third Monday of this month.

"A freedman, residing on the plantation of a Mr. Belshaw, some six miles northeast of the city, was found one day last week near his home, shot through the body. No arrests have been made. It is charged by some of the citizens that the murder was committed by some soldiers belonging to the Fifth Indiana cavalry.

"One day last week, policeman Abercrombie shot Benjamin Chappell, a freedman in the employ of Gen. Davies. The altercation occurred at the policeman's house, and while he was off duty. Mr. Abercrombie's friends claim that the freedman snapped a pistol at him four times, whereupon he shot Chappell twice. It was supposed that the wound was mortal, but late reports state that Chappell will recover. Parties cognizant of the facts state that prior to Chappell's marrying his present wife, she had three children by Abercrombie, and that recently Abercrombie was desirous of renewing the connection, to which Chappell objected. At the preliminary examination before Justice Hettles, Abercrombie was bound over in the sum of twenty-four hundred dollars. The only witness was one Andrew, a freedman. As soon as the preliminary examination was over, the attorney for the defendant proposed to arrest this witness as an accomplice, a species of legal chicanery which was prevented by the provost guard taking charge of Andrew and delivering him over to the Provost for safety. Gen. Davies having interested himself in the matter, the policeman may get justice done him."

DISARMING THE NEGROES.

From the Chicago Tribune.

THE first exercise of authority by the so-called "State government" of each of the reconstructing Southern States, is signalized by a wholesale and glaring overthrow of the Constitution of the United States, in its bearing on one-third of the people of the entire South—the colored people. The Constitution provides that "a well regulated militia being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of THE PEOPLE to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed." And further, "that the right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated." The word people is the very broadest term that can be used to cover all classes of population. Worcester defines people as follows: "Those who compose a community, persons or men in general; folks; population. The commonalty as opposed to persons of rank the populace—the vulgar." Conceding for the argument that the system of caste were to be maintained at the South, thereby elevating the whites into "persons of rank," and sinking the blacks into persons of no rank, and the latter would then be preeminently "the people;" hence their "right to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed," and their right to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, however low the caste or grade to which they belong, so long as they are not made chattels or slaves. Nay, if there are to be any differences of caste, the lower their caste, the more emphatically are they part of "the people." That the word was used in this broadest sense in the Constitution of the United States is evident from the fact that even the slaves, in their mixed condition of persons and property, form a part of "the people," and count each as three-fifths of a man in arriving at the number of people for whom a representative shall be chosen, though the latter are elected by a smaller class called "electors." The Constitution of the United States could not be more explicit than it is. It could not more plainly apply to the freedmen of the South than it does in these clauses. No Federal court can refuse to protect them in this right.

And yet the first act of the State administrations now partially in power in the Southern States, is to violate the Constitution by disarming the colored people. They have done this in Mississippi and Alabama, and are carrying out the same programme in South Carolina, and will undoubtedly pursue it in other Southern States. We denounce it as a palpable violation of the Constitution of the United States, which should not for an hour be permitted.

But it is also without the shadow of excuse or necessity. Throughout four years of a fearful civil war the negroes have not in a single instance shown themselves unfit to be entrusted with arms. The massacres, insurrections, assassinations, and other displays of savagery and barbarism which it was freely predicted they would commit, have all been committed by their masters. On the contrary, the kindness, loyalty, Unionism, and chivalry, which were so boastfully claimed by their masters, have all been manifested, so far as they have been manifested at all at the South, by the colored people. Where one reason exists for disarming the negroes, a hundred exist for disarming the whites. No despotic and ruthless master envies the white his freedom, his wages, his wife, or his children. No hostile neighbor threatens his house, person or property. He needs no arms in self-defence. The negro does. He is weak. He is not represented in the Legislature. He is barely and reluctantly free. In many districts his master is disposed to re-enslave him. His house is not yet his castle. The courts do not yet protect him. The outrages are all committed on him. The ruffians are all disposed to make him their victim. He needs especially the Constitutional right to defend himself from a renewal of the late oppression under which he has suffered with his people. He needs the privilege of defending his house as his castle. Constitutionally too mild and humane, the only danger is that he will not resent injuries nor contend against oppression. It is in behalf of just such as he that the clauses above quoted were framed and should be enforced.

RECONSTRUCTION.—A POSSIBLE CHANGE OF POLICY, AND WHY.

[The Cincinnati *Commercial* from which we copy the following article, is a journal of the extreme "Conservative" type. Its point of view is a very different one from ours, and there are statements herein with which we by no means agree, but the article is valuable as showing the dissatisfaction with the President's policy which even Conservatives begin to express.]

THE Southern papers, with great unanimity, express their confidence in President Johnson. They tell us that he stands between the people of the South and the Radicals of the North; he it is who will prevent the exaction of humiliating conditions. Very good. But what is the plain duty of the people South who have this potential friend at Court? He tells them that there are certain things that they must do, and certain things that they ought to do, if they expect him to successfully resist the demands of the Radicals. They must repeal their ordinances of secession; they must declare slavery abolished forever; they must repudiate their war debt. These conditions, they are told, are imperative, and must be complied with. They ought to ratify the Constitutional Amendment; they ought to abolish class legislation, protect the negroes in their civil rights, qualify them as witnesses, elect conservative men to office, and in all things comport themselves as men earnestly resolved not only to restore the States to the Union, but the hearts of the people.

Now what, in fact, are the people of these States, through their conventions, ballot-boxes, and legislatures, doing? Lip-service is cheap; what is the purport of their acts? The President will determine whether these people are to be trusted, not by what they say, but by what they do. They have repealed or annulled the ordinances of secession; they have declared slavery abolished by the Federal Government, and in their organic laws have recognized the fact. They have, in Mississippi and Alabama, promptly, and in Georgia and North Carolina reluctantly, repudiated, or set aside, the war debt. Beyond this, the wishes of the President have not been regarded, while his expectations have been disappointed. Such of the Legislatures as are in session, have maintained an ominous silence on the question of ratifying the Constitutional Amendment; they have refused or neglected to abolish class legislation; they have rather sought to perpetuate it under the plea of necessity, as though any necessity ever existed for the perpetuation of wrong; they have in some States elected to the office of Governor men who were original secessionists, bitter enemies of the Government during all its struggle for existence, and for aught they have said or done since, its bitter enemies at heart, over men who were, at the beginning, opposed to secession, who refrained as much as possible from encouraging its pretensions to independence, and who were the first to step forward, after the war, to assist the Administration in the work of reconstruction. They have elected to Congress, in many districts, men who cannot take the Congressional test oath, knowing their inability to do so, and with the express purpose, it is believed, of defying a law designed to keep out of the National Assembly that class of politicians. The Government, in good faith, established a Freedmen

qualify them to be useful and industrious members of society, a foolish prejudice and persecuting malignity have been combined to defeat the enterprise.

We should prefer to report a different state of things, but the facts are, for the present, against us. If, then, the President does not manifest particular eagerness on the subject of restoration; if he telegraphs to the Provisional Governors of the Carolinas to hold on till ordered to vacate in favor of the Governors elect, Messrs. Hampton and Worth; if he indicates or proposes to continue a semi-military supervision of these States, and hesitates about receiving them into full communion, it will not be at all difficult to discover the causes that have led to this change in his policy. The people of the South have been told by the President and by those who understood his plan of reorganization, that it was experimental, not final, and depended for its permanence on the action and spirit of the people of the Southern States themselves. If a change in his purposes takes place, it will not be the result of Radical pressure at the North, but disloyal pressure at the South. He has met those lately in rebellion more than half way, and has held the sacrificial-knife ready these many months to kill the fatted calf, and make merry over the return of the prodigals who have wasted their substance in riotous living. They must do something for themselves, however.

RICHMOND.

[So many repeals of old laws and enactments of new have been the subject of congratulation of late in Richmond, that we insert the following from the *Tribune* as illustrative of the nearness to the millennial state which is reached already in that favored metropolis.]

Among other evidences of the "healthy loyalty" which pervades the reconstructed rebel capital, we find the statement of Lieut.-Col. John Grummill of the 5th Ohio cavalry, from which it appears that the police of Richmond do not content themselves with outraging colored loyalists. A blue uniform is enough to excite their rage—no matter whether it covers a black skin or a white. Col. Grummill says:

"Men of my command, who were duly sober—men who were never known to be drunk or disorderly—while passing along the streets, or while stopping at places where refreshments could be obtained, were pounced upon by the police, and taken to the station-house; and there the police were ordered, in the language of one of the officers in charge, to 'go through them, damn them: go through them.' The police took the arms, the private property of the men—their pocket-books and money. Then, when my men were released from that prison, they demanded their property and money which had been taken from them by the police, which demand was refused, and the fact of the authorities having the money flatly denied; and instead of their property in accordance with their just demands, they received insulting and ungentlemanly answers. The property, as yet, has not been returned."

This was not the act of subordinates; it was justified by the Chief of Police. An officer who had lost his arms by intrusting them to a colored servant, from whom the Police plundered them, applied to Major Croft, Chief of Police, for their restoration. The answer was that "he would have taken them from him as quick as from his nigger, and the best thing you can do is to go back to your quarters, or I will put you under arrest."

We advise Major Croft to run for Congress. He would be sure to be elected. Whether he would be admitted may depend on the opinion entertained by the House of the value of the loyalty reconstructed on this pattern.

THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP ELLIOT, OF GEORGIA.

[The following from the Newport (R. I.) *News*, is from the pen of a leading member of Trinity Church, Newport.]

Mr. Editor: In your remarks upon the letter and conduct of Bishop Elliot, a few days ago, you omitted to notice the worst features in the Bishop's character and that of all the clergy and ministers of the Gospel, of all denominations, in the Southern rebel States. These men profess to be ambassadors of the God of love. Bishop Elliot and the Episcopal Ministry profess to be apostolically descended, or successors of the apostles—if so, the mantle of Judas Iscariot must have fallen upon them, for, in what does their conduct show any likeness to St. Paul, St. Peter, or any other of the apostles, save Judas only? In what have they illustrated by their conduct the Sermon on the Mount which they have read to their congregations, Sunday after Sunday, for years, if they have not meditated upon it in their closets?

If, indeed, the conduct of Bishop Elliot and other clergymen of the South *be* the result of studying the Bible—*the fruit of the Gospel*—then, alas! it is bitter fruit—the apple of the Dead Sea—nay, hardly that, for it has not even *external* beauty; it is rather the fruit of hell, and these men—the disciples of devils—these men, for months, if not for years, while they were engaged in hatching treason and leading their flocks to rebellion—converting the sheep intrusted to their care into goats, and "changing the truth of God into a lie"—read Sunday after Sunday, from the Litany, in solemn mockery of religion, and with smooth-faced hypocrisy, the following petitions to the God of all truth:

"From pride, vainglory, and hypocrisy; from envy, hatred, malice, and *all uncharitableness*, good Lord deliver us.

"From all *sedition*, privy *conspiracy* and *rebellion*, good Lord deliver us."

Now, sir, where was this successor of the apostles and other pretended Southern ambassadors of Jesus Christ, who had invoked God for years to *deliver* them and their people from *all uncharitableness*, when the Union prisoners at Andersonville were being carried out at the rate of twenty a day in carts; having died from starvation in the midst of plenty, and from cruel and inhuman treatment,—not done in secret, but proclaimed in the press and boasted of before the world? We do not hear of any of these "Holy men of God" going to these prisoners to perform the Christian office of burying the dead or comforting the sick, or relieving the distressed. Nay, more, sir, we do not hear of these "Holy men of God" proclaiming, like the prophets of old, the judgments of God against the sins of their rulers and of the people, nor do we hear any of them, not even Bishop Elliot in his crape canonicals, lifting up his voice against barbarities to helpless prisoners which would disgrace savages.

Where then was the charitable "cup of cold water," pronounced by our Saviour to be so eternally blessed to the giver who administered to one—even to the least of his children or people? Where was the great doctrine of charity preached by this apostate Bishop and his fellows in treason, rebellion and cruelty? Where was his saintly brother whom he would canonize—the Right Rev. Bishop Gen. Polk—God save the mark? Why, sir, he was drinking and consorting with murderers, ferocious guerillas, who were engaged in the pious and praiseworthy occupation of murdering harmless women, children and old men. God save the sheep and lambs of the church-fold from such shepherds, say I. B.

CRIME IN TENNESSEE.

A NARRATIVE OF OUTRAGES.

The Nashville papers confirm Gov. Brownlow's account of the prevalence of crime in Tennessee. A single number of the *Union* of that city gives the particulars of a dozen outrages and murders, and the editor remarks as follows:

"The vicinity of this city is full of thieves, robbers, and murderers. Crime in every grade is rampant—goes almost unchecked. The malefactors go in gangs and single; they are both black and white, and sometimes these two classes operate together. They hover around, from two to five miles from the city, so that they are out of the jurisdiction of the police, yet are near enough to waylay and rob all parties approaching or departing from the city.

"They go armed to the teeth; carry rifles, Government muskets and pistols; and are entirely reckless of human life, murdering as if it were a delightful pastime. They appear to take so much pleasure in killing that they would rather strike down their victim than to rob him unscathed.

"Who these men are, and whence they come, it is difficult to say; but they conduct their operations with a boldness that must satisfy any one that they are beyond all redemption; that there is but a single way of preventing their further inroads—by hanging them. The ordinary penalties of the law have no terror for them; pursuits by constables and sheriffs are regarded as excellent practical jokes; and they have no dread of the walls of the jail-house, because they never expect to see their inner surfaces."

The *Union* then gives a long list of assaults and attempted murders, and adds:

"No wonder that vegetables are high in the market, when gardeners only visit the city at the risk of their lives; no wonder farmers refuse to plant and sow, when there is no assurance that the proceeds of a year's labor will not be snatched from them in a moment by robber hands."

The St. Louis papers complain of a similar state of affairs in that city.

Hatred of the Negroes in South Carolina.—A correspondent of the N. Y. *Post* says that a Union surgeon, travelling in Barnwell (S. C.) district recently, was candidly told that he "ought to begin to bleed all the niggers to death, for they had got to be killed off in some way." Another man told him that "the Federals ought to kill off all the niggers before they went away, or the people here would have to do it." The people in that section of South Carolina are especially bitter towards the colored people.

National Anti-Slavery Standard.

WITHOUT CONCEALMENT—WITHOUT COMPROMISE.

NEW YORK, SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 1865.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION.

No State shall make any distinction in civil rights and privileges among the naturalized citizens of the United States residing within its limits, or among persons born on its soil of parents permanently resident there, on account of race, color, or descent.

The Standard Subscribers to whom bills are sent, will confer a favor by remitting the amounts due at their earliest convenience.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE.

A wise Reconstruction policy requires another Constitutional amendment. Our profession is Democracy. In truly Democratic government, suffrage is shared by all classes of citizens. Thus far in this country the experiment of a Democracy has been one in name only, not of fact. Classes, numerically a majority, hitherto have been excluded from suffrage. De Tocqueville wrote: "There is no more invariable rule in society; the farther electoral rights are extended, the more is felt the need of extending them; * * * concession follows concession, and no stop can be made short of universal suffrage." The time has arrived for us to demand *Universal Suffrage*. Abundant proof of the inadequacy of partial suffrage exists in the political history and present attitude of our nation. Our troubles have arisen, not as our enemies at home and abroad have asserted, because of our democracy, but from our want of it. Our record is one of fearful transgression. We have not only withheld suffrage from millions of our countrymen as fully entitled to it as ourselves, but we have committed the flagrant outrage of converting them into merchandise!

The yet pending amendment of the Constitution abolishing and prohibiting slavery, will, when ratified, legally terminate chattelism. A glorious consummation indeed that will be. It is, however, insufficient as related to the welfare of the emancipated and the nation. It leaves the millions freed from chattel slavery still suffering disabilities greatly exceeding those which our forefathers rose in rebellion to oppose. Our readers have been faithfully apprised of the innumerable wrongs and shocking cruelties to which these people are now subjected, although the good faith of the nation is pledged to protect them in freedom. The power to protect themselves is yet to be vouchsafed to them.

The object of our present writing is to urge upon the attention of our readers the importance of another Amendment of the Constitution of the United States, without which the first must prove sadly inadequate, and Democracy in the nation remain as hitherto in large measure an empty, delusive profession, and not an ennobling reality. We may still gather lessons of wisdom, as of old, from our opponents. A few weeks since a popular convention was held in one of the counties of Virginia, addressed among other distinguished speakers, by the "Hon." R. L. Montague, once a Lieutenant-Governor of the State, and since a Representative in the Confederate Congress. Mr. Montague frankly avowed the opinion that the origin of the late war was not slavery, but "*the too great extension of the Democratic principle*; and there could be no permanent peace until this was restrained." He argued that it would "be impossible to establish a permanent peace, and to avoid eternal wrangling, unless there were two sections of the present Constitution of the United States expunged. The first of these relates to the Right of Suffrage, and is contained in the first clause of section second, article first, and says: 'The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for the electors of the most numerous branch of the State Legislature;' this is too general—*too democratic*." The other objectionable feature in the Constitution, as argued by Mr. Montague, is contained in the first clause of section eight, article 1, declaring the power of Congress to lay and collect taxes, duties, imports, etc. etc. He said:

"To expunge these objectionable features from the Constitution—to restrict the Right of Suffrage to persons who owned real estate—to subdue the radical, agrarian, democratic elements, and to define precisely the rights of the States—were duties incumbent upon the young men of Virginia. Their fathers had been leaders in the politics of the old Union. Their sons of this generation should at least help to fashion the destinies of the reconstructed federation of States.

"Mr. Montague concluded with an eloquent peroration, recalling the glory and honor of Virginia, as illustrated in the past, and more recently in the bloody ordeal of the war just concluded, and appealed to the youth to follow the examples of Washington and Lee, both natives of the immediate neighborhood. For himself, he said that he felt no sorrow for anything that he had done, nor did he know of any honorable man engaged in the late struggle who did. It was only cowards and hypocrites who were cringing to and fawning about the powers that be, with words of remorse and contrition."

We quote the conclusion of Mr. Montague's remarks as another proof that the old spirit of domination was never stronger than now with the slaveholders who have suffered military defeat, but who hope yet to triumph through the aid they propose to render in fashioning "the destinies of the reconstructed federation of States."

Our potent answer to their former infamous assumptions in behalf of slavery was—*abolition*. Our answer to this characteristic demand for a modification of the Constitution to curtail and restrict suffrage should be an amendment guaranteeing *universal suffrage*.

Congress is to meet again in a few days. With that body will rest a weighty responsibility in establishing anew the foundations of government in the rebellious districts. With it, and not with the President, will be proper jurisdiction upon this subject. The cruel, unjust "experiment" of disfranchising loyal blacks, and "conciliating" red-handed traitors should now give place to a just and humane statesmanship, which will rebuild upon the broad, enduring basis of Democracy, without invidious distinctions against loyal blacks, and prescribing a wholesome period of probation at least, as a punishment of guilty pale-faced traitors. Great were the responsibilities which rested upon the Convention of 1787 over which Washington presided. The foundations of Government were then unsettled, and it was sought to "form a more perfect Union, establish justice, and secure the blessings of liberty." The negro then, as now, was a candidate for Democratic liberty,—equality before the law. The counsels of "conservatism" prevailed in the convention—the negro was sacrificed. The New York *Times* had not then been established, but its progenitors were influential members of that body. There were also the Luther Martins, in the minority, whose prophetic warnings, familiar to the readers of this journal, were unheeded. How they have since been fulfilled, the national mourning and the hundreds of thousands of soldiers graves, bear painful witness.

Greater, by so much as the Nation has enlarged its proportions and received greater light, is the responsibility which will devolve upon Congress at its coming session. If justice be allowed to prevail in its counsels, well will it be for the Nation; woe will be unto it if otherwise.

We therefore earnestly urge that Congress make early and unqualified declaration that no State will be recognized as properly reconstructed without having guaranteed equality before the law for all within its borders, except such as are guilty of crime. We urge especially that measures be initiated for an amendment of the Constitution, providing explicitly that suffrage shall be guaranteed to *all persons living within the United States twenty one years of age, duly naturalized and not guilty of felony or treason*. Without, in this view, assuming to speak for the society which this journal represents, we will take occasion to say that, with John Stuart Mill, we would make the broad application of our claim for suffrage to include women as well as the negro. We urge Congress to initiate measures for such an amendment of the Constitution as we have indicated, and to pass a law upon the subject of reconstruction, requiring impartial suffrage as a condition of readmission, because justice requires it, and thus much is necessary to make good the pledge that "the United States shall guaranty to every State of this Union a Republican form of government."

There are earnest, noble, men in both the Senate and House of Representatives, who will gladly consecrate themselves to this work, and whose success will be certain if only they can receive adequate encouragement and support from their constituents, in different parts of the country. The methods of educating and directing public opinion we have hitherto proved to be so efficient in opposition to chattelism, should now be employed as far as practicable, and not less earnestly to achieve impartial, universal suffrage. The press, meetings and lectures, memorials and petitions, and all honorable methods of influence and power should be at once vigorously brought to bear upon this subject. The present is the golden period of opportunity.

This question is not one of ordinary political interest and expediency. Its moral bearings have a deep and important significance as affecting our countrymen maimed by slavery, our own personal integrity, and the honor, progress and true prosperity of the nation.

MEETING AT MILTON ON THE HUDSON.

Many years ago a bird of benignant omen dropped a truth seed in the little town of Milton in Ulster County, New York. It soon germinated and began to yield golden harvests. One of these was a Society of Progressive Friends, unfolded out of a little meeting of the so-called Hicksite Friends or Quakers, and their house of worship became a temple of Truth and Freedom. Regular meetings were held on Sundays, in which human men and women (not divine, or ordained), discussed freely and intelligently whatever subject affected the destiny of man in his material, mental, moral, and spiritual nature. Sometimes lectures, single or serial, were provided for, and many of the best minds of the country were happy to contribute of their wisdom in the culture of so hopeful and fruitful a field. The Sunday meeting was well sustained until some of the older members and supporters of it were removed by death, and the war levied its terrible demand on the young and the strong. So many of these last returned no more, that at length the congregation is reduced to a handful of women, almost, though a few men, (alas, how few!) survive; and the meetings are but irregularly held. Last Sunday was the first for a considerable time past, when any effort was made to obtain an audience. Then the weather was most unpropitious, and not many excepting only the faithful and the hopeful few, came. But their earnestness and devotion were truly inspiring and elevating to the soul—able to unlock prisons of doubt and despair. It seemed in depth and fervor, a meeting of the Huguenots and Waldenses in the fastnesses of the mountains, when the Edict of Nantes had been revoked and the faithful had been swept by fiery tempests of persecution from their wonted altars and their homes, to such refuge as the dens and caves of the wilderness yield. The numbers to human vision were indeed small; but the power of such meetings is not measured by the multiplication table, nor are their results to be computed by any human intellect. There is a warfare where one can chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight. Races are surely not always to the swift. Battles do not always yield to the strong. Our own war with the South was witness to that. We had ten men to her one, but we could not subdue her. We had a hundred or a thousand dollars to her one, but she did not surrender. We had military resources of every kind in similar proportion, but still she was not conquered. We had a national prestige abroad and at home, she was but hordes of insurgents by land and crews of pirates on sea; but her name and power were terrible and we quailed before them. Our cause was (or it was our fault and sin and shame if it was not) divine, hers was all over devilish; but she defied us still. Had her military and material resources borne any fair proportion to our own, by all human calculation we must have been hurled before her to destruction in the very first year of the war. We had an unseen foe more mighty than all the armies of the rebellion. We would not hear the voice nor see the hand of God in the terrible visitation. We would not do justice in proclaiming liberty to the captive, and so the battles were multiplied and prolonged. It was not Jeff. Davis, but the power of the moral universe against which we contended, and contended in vain. Our foe was permitted to triumph, or at least to hold out, until we were humbled in the dust, and glad to be saved by the negro whom we had despised and rejected; who, through us, was still "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief."

In the light of this philosophy is the Milton meeting to be interpreted. It was great because gathered in the spirit of truth, as it was called only in the name of humanity. It was great because the truth was there spoken without concealment and without compromise. It was great because the truth was received, believed and carried into effective action according to the means at hand. And in one important sense more was it very great. It was made apparent there how momentous is the work still remaining for the Abolitionists to do—the Abolitionists and none other. Should they withhold their hand even to-day, it might almost be said safely in this land, there would no flesh be saved. For if we are saved, we must be saved by truth and justice. We may give all our old clothes to the freedmen; we may bestow all our stores of food to feed them; Bellows and Beecher may speak with the tongues of men and of angels; Presidents may understand all mysteries and Congress all knowledge; Gen. Grant may give the bodies of another half million to be burned in the fire and brimstone of war; but without justice we are nothing. Vain is all legislation; vain are all Freedmen's Commissions; vain are all orations; vain are all prayers, fastings, or thanksgivings. Unless we do justice and execute righteousness towards those for whom the war came upon us, we shall be scourged and plagued until our land become a desolation and the Pharaohs thereof perish.

Men of experience in the meeting saw and felt how insufficient are all plans or experiments of reconstruction based on such cruel injustice as the disfranchisement of the most loyal people of the South, only for their color, and in some States a majority besides. Mourning mothers, and wives too, were there whose sons sleep to wake no more on bloody battle-fields, beseeching that the lives of their brave loved and lost ones, be not wasted by persistent injustice and cruelty on the part of the people and the Government. And their entreaty, and the counsel of the oldest and wisest present, and the earnest readiness with which every word was heard by all, proved unmistakably how momentous is the mission of every faithful Abolitionist at the present moment, and what solemn responsibilities still rest on the old American Anti-Slavery Society.

The Fenians of the Frontier.—The *Herald* says the Gov.-General of Canada, "having had under consideration the possibility that raids" of Fenians may occur during the winter, has issued orders calling out for frontier service, for as long a period as may be necessary, one company of volunteers from each of the towns of Quebec, Montreal, Hamilton, London, Port Hope and Woodstock, and directing all officers of volunteer corps throughout the province to complete their numbers and hold themselves in readiness for marching and actual service at a moment's notice. The volunteers will receive seven dollars and a half a month, or twenty-five cents a day. The Montreal people were alarmed on Sunday last by a hoax to the effect that an armed force of Fenians had paraded the streets of a Vermont village close to the Canadian line.

Military Interference with Churches Stopped.—President Johnson has rescinded the order of Maj.-Gen. Thomas shutting up the Episcopal churches of Alabama, thus making it certain that the South is victorious in one most important branch of her Church at least.

THE PHILOSOPHER AND THE REFORMER.

Rev. O. B. Frothingham, in his sermon of Sunday, Nov. 12th, on the premise that "Justice is the Mother of Wisdom," made the following illustration of the difference between the Philosopher and the Reformer:

There are two ways of getting an understanding of this working wisdom of the Omniscient. One way is the way of thought; the other way is the way of practice. One way is adopted by the Buckles, the Herbert Spencers, the Stuart Mills, the Henry Carys, the John Drapers—the students in social science who try by thought to work their way into the Divine solution of the practical problem of life. The other way is adopted by the Clarksons, Wilberforces, Garrisons, Phillipses, Fryes, John Brights, Cobdens, Dixes, in a word, by the practical reformers, who take things up in their actual relations, meet the facts of life as they present themselves, and let theories follow as they will. Philosophy starts from the outside and works inward; religion from the inside and works outward. Philosophy says, "wisdom leads to justice;" the wise man must be just. Religion leads to wisdom; the just man must be wise. Philosophy says, "learn the truth and you will do the Divine will." Religion says, "do the Divine will and you will know the truth." Philosophy says, "justice is the fruit of wisdom." Religion says, "wisdom is the fruit of justice.

There can be no question which of these methods is the simpler. The method of Philosophy is exceedingly difficult. None but the rarest minds can pursue it. The method of religion is perfectly easy. None are too simple to find it out. The only difficulty is that it is too plain. "Do as you want to be done by." Why, anybody can do that! "Wash in the Jordan!" cries Naaman, "why I might as well have staid at home!" Deal fairly by thy neighbor! Pay thy debts! Who that has the will to understand, cannot understand what that is? There is not a rational person who does not know how he would wish to be treated in any case. There is not a rational person, therefore, whose mind does not lie close against the facts of life, which are the compacted wisdom of the Almighty; whose hand does not lie close against the hand which works the saving laws of the universe; whose daily habits are not twined in with the cords by which the world of society and of events is moved. Our very sensations tell us whether we are in the line of God's working or not. Our health or our sickness, our security or our insecurity, our victories or our disasters, our commercial overthrows or successes, show whether we are working with the grain or against it.

Social relations precede social theories. Life goes before speculation about life. Rules of living grow out of experiments in living, and are simply reports on those experiments. The state of society in Palestine accounts for the barbarous law of blood for blood, in the early Hebrew code. That style of society must disappear entirely before a wiser law can be passed and maintained. The execution in Washington last Friday showed that that state of society had not wholly disappeared. We do not live in such relations yet that the golden rule of good for evil, or even the silver rule of good for good, can be proposed. The condition of Europe in the middle ages explains the laws, the customs and the creeds of the middle ages. The doctrine of human depravity, the rules based on that doctrine, the family precepts, the notions regarding the rearing of children, the savage maxims respecting the treatment of the poor, the sick, the insane, the criminal, the wicked, the impious, the bloody codes of honer, the fiendish doctrines of vengeance and retaliation which were exalted as the very pith of wisdom, followed the social relations which they professed to lead. Inhumanity in life generated inhumanity in thought. Men began with bad practice then justified it by bad law. Would there have been any theory of a wrathful, avanging God, if wrath and vengeance had not characterized the dealings of men with their neighbors? Would there have been any horrid teachings about hell in the other world if people had not made a hell in this world. We stand aghast at the hideous folly and unreason which passed for wisdom in generations gone by, but when we get at the root of it we find it always in some practical folly and unreason which men were living."

Negro Wages and White Equality Down South.—In the supplement of a late number of the Montgomery (Ala.) *Advertiser* we find, says the *Herald*, the advertisement of Dillard, McMinn & Co.'s "White Labor Agency" of said town. In this advertisement their offers to white laborers are thus set forth:

RATES OF HIRE OF WHITE LABOR.

Men, per year	$150
Women, per year	100
Children of 12 or 14 years of age, per year	50
House servants, per month	15

Payable at the end of the year.

They contract for one year, to do the same work as the negro; live in the same cabins, and on the same rations; clothe themselves, and pay their own doctor's bills. Time lost by sickness deducted from wages.

One in every six of Germans agree to speak English.

Cost of transportation, $15 per head, to accompany orders, but to be deducted from wages.

Dillard, McMinn & Co., Agents.

An order will be forwarded to New York on Saturday, the 11th inst.

The *Herald* adds, "'one hundred and fifty dollars, payable at the end of the year,' to an able-bodied white man, in the cotton field, 'to do the same work as the negro, live in the same cabins and on the same rations,' etc. This is a step in the way of 'equal rights' to whites and blacks; but at the rates proposed we guess that Dillard, McMinn & Co. will not for some time be burdened with surplus Germans." The *Herald* probably knows that its sneer would be absurd in any country on the globe but this—no other but this making distinctions in "cabins, pay or rations," among working men on account of color. Prejudice against color belongs to Democratic, Republican, Christian America. Here it was first born. Here it will doubtless last die.

Governor Morton and the President.—The *World's* Washington Correspondent of Nov. 21 writes that Gov. Morton, of Indiana, had a protracted interview with the President yesterday. He found Mr. Johnson fully determined in support of his reconstruction policy. His Excellency thought that there might be at first some opposition in Congress which would soon pass away as restoration became more fully developed. The people, he added, thought that the Southern States moved rather slow, but, all things considered, he believed they were doing remarkably well. He complimented the Governor on his Richmond, Indiana, speech, and said that he fully indorsed it.

The Vicksburg *Herald* says that Gen. Howard has stated that he had discovered that the condition of affairs in the Southern States were not sufficiently promising to justify him in recommending the withdrawal of the Freedmen's Bureau. He regarded the condition of the freedmen in Georgia and Alabama as unpromising.

Judge Chase on the Ballot.—At a great meeting in Brooklyn, on Tuesday of this week, a letter was read from Chief-Justice Chase containing the following passages:

WASHINGTON, D. C., Nov. 20, 1865.

Gentlemen: Nothing but imperative public business would detain me from the meeting to be held to-morrow evening, under the auspices of the American Union Commission, the Freedmen's Aid Commission and the American Missionary Association.

Its object, the relief of suffering at the South, without regard to color, must command the sympathy of all good and patriotic men.

To suppress rebellion the American people put forth vast energies, counting neither treasure nor life dear in comparison with an undivided country; and never in the history of the world, was a civil war waged with so little rancor or vindictiveness on the part of the nation against rebels. * * * * * *

The war has brought great changes. Among these the enfranchisement of 4,000,000 of slaves as the greatest and most momentous. The conversion of this vast population from bondsmen to freemen and citizens imposes on the people of the States in which this wonderful revolution has taken place, on the people of the other States, and on the Government of the whole country, new and peculiar duties. It is important that these new citizens should be assured that these duties will be neither evaded nor neglected. * * * *

I cannot disguise my conviction that the surest and shortest road to permanent peace, settled order, sound credit, contented industry, and in general prosperity in every State, is the frank recognition of the right of every citizen, white or colored, to protect his and his neighbor's freedom, and promote his and his neighbor's welfare by his vote.

But I shall rejoice in seeing good done and in promoting the doing of it, in whatever measure or kind, and by whatever agency or authority. We made war to save the Union. The Providence of God made our war for the Union a war for universal freedom in America, and crowned it with success. Now comes the work of restoration and renovation. Let it be prosecuted with wise patriotism, sincere good-will and impartial justice, and who will dare doubt that God will crown this work also with success?

Yours, very truly, S. P. Chase.

PERSONAL.

The Memphis *Appeal* remarks innocently:

"Jefferson Davis, if permitted to remain in the country, would, we believe, go back to his old, natural and appropriate stand among the most useful and laborious of the conservative statesmen of America."

The *Appeal*, of course, is a "loyal" paper now, by the grace of Andrew Johnson and after his pattern.

The Republicans of Boston have re-nominated the Hon. F. W. Lincoln, Jr., for Mayor. Anti-slavery men will remember him as the predecessor of Mayor Wightman. The two differ in this, that Lincoln only tolerated a mob, while Wightman put himself at the head of one. Is it this negative virtue that recommends Mr. Lincoln for repeated Republican nominations?

John Ruskin has been carrying on a controversy with the London *Telegraph* and Pall Mall *Gazette*, in regard to tenants and houses. Being told that his theories were impracticable, he has bought some real estate, lets tenements to poor lodgers at a just price, and writes that the experiment pays a fair percentage on the outlay.

Speaker Colfax's talk to the friends who surrounded him at Washington on Saturday evening, says the *Tribune*, may be fairly accepted as embodying the collective judgment of a large majority of the new Congress, as well as of the people who elected them, with regard to some of the more immediate problems presented of the great and difficult work of National Reconstruction. The *Tribune* is also assurance to us and all concerned, that Mr. Colfax is no "fanatic," no "negro-worshipper." This was pretty well understood before.

Dr. James McCune Smith, one of the best known colored men in this vicinity, died in Williamsburg last week of a pulmonary affection, from which he had been suffering for nearly 20 months, in the 52d year of his age. He was born in New York, was educated and graduated at Glasgow, Scotland, and had been a practicing physician for a quarter of a century. He had always felt a deep interest in the cause of his race, and had labored zealously and constantly to ameliorate and elevate the condition of the colored men in this country, both bond and free, who have lost in him one of their best friends and most able advocates.

A New York correspondent of the Macon (Ga.) *Telegraph*, writing on the 16th of October, gives currency to the following story:

"Since I have introduced Mr. Seward's name, I will refer to a conversation he had a few days since with Thurlow Weed—Jefferson Davis being the subject. Weed said Mr. Davis should be hanged, and expressed himself quite warmly on the subject. Mr. Seward then propounded the query, 'Why should you hang him?' to which Weed replied: 'I would hang him for treason.' Mr. Seward responded in his energetic way: 'We cannot hang him without first convicting him, and I think no impartial jury would do that.' Weed said: 'His guilt is already established, and his conviction should not be difficult;' but Mr. Seward maintained that no jury could be formed to convict him, and added in a significant way: 'And even if we should hang him, it would be no great moral lesson to the world.' Gentlemen who were present during the conversation infer from it that Mr. Davis' life is safe at least."

The New Orleans *Picayune*, a loyal paper of the "reconstructed" sort, illuminates its columns with the following encomium on a fugitive traitor:

"J. P. Benjamin, our former fellow-citizen, so distinguished in the South for his eloquence, legal ability and great accomplishments, writes to his relatives and friends in this city, that he has been received and treated with great kindness and generosity by many of the prominent statesmen of England; that he is awaiting the legal term of residence to qualify him for admission to the English bar, in order to resume the practice of his profession in London or Liverpool, and that he manages to support himself very comfortably by giving counsel and legal aid to his friends and others in regard to legal matters in this country."

No doubt Mr. Benjamin has a cordial reception in England. Mr. Jefferson Davis would have one still more cordial.

The following interesting document illustrates the kind of loyalty in favor under the Banks-Hahn-Wells government in Louisiana:

"A CARD.

"*To the Editor of the Picayune:* I have been deeply pained and mortified by learning that for the last three days, reports have been widely circulated through the city that I had gone on board the Yankee fleet now opposite the city. I have been at home since last Saturday, quite ill most of the time, and under the treatment of my physician. So far from going on board of the fleet or the enemies of that government in which I was born, and all my children raised, and to whose constitution I have sworn a willing allegiance, such a thought never entered my mind; and I beg of the public, and particularly of my friends, to give no credence to the reports thus injuriously circulated against me.

"Yours truly, A. P. Field.

"New Orleans, May 1, 1862."

This Mr. Field is now a zealous Union man, claimed a seat in Congress last winter, and is the same person who attacked the Hon. W. D. Kelly, of Pennsylvania, and wounded him with a knife, because Mr. Kelly had opposed his admission.

Mr. Gladstone recently delivered four speeches in Edinburgh in three days. He threw out two very remarkable indications of the kind of Reform Bill which he is prepared to support. With regard to the franchise he said, "Whenever Parliament shall find the opportunity of addressing itself to the consideration of that question, and will approach it in the spirit on the one hand of prudence, on the other of manliness and justice, the end which they will propose to themselves will be public justice, and they will seek by any provisions they may incorporate in the law, *neither to continue, nor to set up, nor in any manner to favor dominion*, or the undue influence, of one class as compared with another."

Of a debate which has been much talked of in private circles, and which has excited not a little curiosity, "Warrington" gives the following account:

At the Union-and-Water club, in Park street, on the night of the election, a slight disagreement occurred between these gentlemen on the reconstruction question. Beecher, you know, having got Young Hopeful promoted by the President, has been showing up Gov. Parsons to the Bostonians, and trying to get them to take the million dollars worth of Alabama bonds. So they went to the club-room with the Governor, and Mr. Sumner was also there. Gov. Parsons,—(I see he has been turned out neck-and-heels, by one Bulger, who was a more intense rebel than himself)—Gov. Parsons made a speech. And then Beecher took up the wondrous tale, and talked, nonsense of course, for he talks nothing else now-a-days. He closed by asking whether it would not be a good investment and a clever thing to take some of Brother Alabama's bonds. Whereupon Mr. Sumner rose and said he thought not, giving his reasons therefor, which were, I have no doubt, though his speech has not been reported, that Alabama was a very bogus State, not more than half converted from disloyalty, and though perhaps not intending to take up arms again, yet fully intending to re-establish institutions as nearly as possible on the old basis of injustice and slavery to the black race. Beecher had not sense enough to hold his tongue after this, but tried to reply, and in the course of his remarks, repeated the idiotic argument that the North had no right to insist upon negro suffrage because certain Northern States were not yet ready to grant it. Having thus (in the language of the P. R.) got Beecher's nob into chancery, Mr. Sumner proceeded to punish him to his heart's content, exposing briefly his absurdities, and disposing of him finally, for that occasion at least. But now came Gov. Andrew to the rescue. After rebuking Mr. Sumner for introducing the forbidden topic of politics to the Union-and-Waterites (which he didn't do, for Beecher introduced it, and no blame if he did, for Parsons' errand was necessarily political), he proceeded in a very personal and offensive strain to reply to Mr. Sumner. One who did not take part in the debate reports him to me as saying, "Until this moment, he had hoped Gov. Parsons would be treated by gentlemen as a gentleman." This was bad enough, but I believe the Union-and-Waterites applauded it. The Governor proceeded to elucidate his views further, probably following the text of the circular of his American land company, which declares that "the day of necessary antagonism is past. That of co-operation has come." Which means, boiled down, "Let us forget politics and proceed to make money." Well, the day of "necessary antagonism" never came. The Copperheads were right,—if we had let slavery alone, there would have been no war and no antagonism to bring on a war. But we couldn't let slavery alone. Neither can serfdom and injustice be let alone, no matter who wants to make money. The work of the politician isn't half done yet, and Congress and cabinet and people will have considerable to do before it will be safe to turn all the public attention into the channels of business. To return: Mr. Sumner replied, in gentlemanly terms, and was congratulated afterwards upon speaking aloud what a considerable number of the audience had been only whispering.

Reconstructed Alabama.—A letter received from an Alabama postmaster to-day states that all Union men are rigorously excluded from Reconstruction Conventions and official position. The conviction reigns supreme that the new State government organizations are for the special benefit of all the rebels.

Our Boston Correspondence.

Boston, November 20, 1865.

Ever and anon we have a new illustration of the truth contained in the old couplet

"Surely the pleasure is as great
Of being cheated, as to cheat."

Not long ago a spacious store centrally situated in Washington street was showily furnished with plated and gilded jewelry and articles of table furniture, and the announcement was made in the papers that some "Manufacturing Jewellers' Company" had there established a gigantic "Gift Enterprise." I think these were the phrases. Shares in something or other were to be bought, at a moderate price, and each buyer (besides the value of his share) was to receive "as a Gift" some article of greater value than the sum disbursed, perhaps a gold watch, or a solid silver cake-basket, or a beautiful piano, or an elegant hearth-rug, for these things were conspicuously advertised as among the "Gifts" to be distributed. The shop was closed by the police, after a few days, as a swindling concern. But the noteworthy circumstance is that while it remained open the premises were crowded with Boston people, including many of the rich and fashionable, earnestly competing for a chance to be cheated in this transparent fashion.

Now the same game is being tried again under a little different form. A store of the sort above described has been fitted up in Washington street, and our walls and fences display conspicuous placards, and our newspapers advertisements, to the following effect:

"Gold, Silver, and Oil.

"The salesroom of the New York Petroleum Prize Company is now open, at 317 Washington street.

"Oil Shares for One Dollar!

"A Present given with every Share!

"An immense assortment of Gold and Siver Ware, Watches, Jewelry, Diamonds, Sewing Machines, Pianos, etc., now on exhibition at the salesroom, all of which are to be given to purchasers of shares as Prizes!"

Is it not amazing that any one can be found to throw away a dollar upon such a representation? But the lottery mania is strong, and unless there shall be an interference of the police in this case also, the contrivers of this scheme will probably shear their sheep and carry off the fleece.

This reminds me to inquire—Will Mr. George Lunt, late of the Boston *Courier*, be likely to make much money (or reputation) by his History (now in press) of the Causes that led to our Late War? If this History shall prove to be written in the same spirit with his leading articles in the *Courier*—with no more regard for truth, with no more sense of justice, with no more feeling for the rights of humanity, with no more appreciation of the facts that righteousness exalteth a nation and that sin is a reproach to any people—will it be any better than a literary imposition?

If, however, a work is to be published of the sort that we must expect from this writer, there could be no better time for it than just after his idol has been dethroned and shattered; when the prestige of success has been lost by the infamous system that he favored, and by its infamous supporters; and when a right understanding of the true principles of civil and political liberty, and of the things included in free institutions, is more widely diffused in New England than ever before.

I am glad to see that the Messrs. Appleton, of your city, have republished in this country the "History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe, by W. E. H. Lecky, M. A." It is to be hoped that they may have the good judgment to send the work to you for a critical notice. It is spoken of by the best judges abroad as highly valuable.

It is little to the credit of the Unitarians of this city that their best literary representative, *The Christian Examiner*, is suffered to go to New York for an Editor and a Publisher. In the hands of Dr. Hedge it has for many years been growing in vigor and practical usefulness, giving manly expression to the high culture and the advancing thought of that denomination. Its removal to the editorial charge of Dr. Bellows seems to show in its proprietors a disposition to provide for the popularity of the work, at the sacrifice of its zeal for truth and its progress in reform. But this feeling probably correctly represents that of the majority of Unitarians. They are a timid generation, as fearful of advancing upon untried

LETTER FROM GEN. T. PERRONET THOMPSON.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR,—An American statesman has described the President as "making himself three-quarters rebel, in order that the South might be one-quarter Union." Englishmen acknowledge the justice of the description, and wait for the end, as they do when they hear of their cousins being involved with a shaver or a bubble company. There can be little doubt that come what will, a great mark will be left on the history of the world by all that has happened in America. It is as impossible that things should go back to their former state, as that men should revert to cannibalism after tasting roast pork and potatoes. But there may be a vast quantity of mischief done—a great deal of rolling savory bits of human grill under the tongue, and taking lingering farewells, of what can no longer be hoped to be set on the table of herves, in the full glory of the sirloins of vanquished chiefs, or more luxurious still, the neck and small bones of a female of interesting age. The struggle may be slow and tedious, and legions of man-epicures interpose themselves in long array, between the ignorant present and the final extinction of the practice.

The great danger arises from the reins having been put into the hands of a driver with instructions that he held his place for the next four years, and was at liberty to drive the coach into the pit's mouth, if he could find the hole. It is hard struggling against such odds; but it is only a reason the more why somebody should struggle. Fancy that in England there had been the same kind of difficulty about, for instance, General Warrants, and Englishmen had been told: "The thing is past help. It is in the hands of your appointed lord and master for the next four years. There is no use in stirring; because you cannot. There have been times for exhibiting the courage of John Bull; but this is for exhibiting his patience." The result would clearly have been, that there would have been one of those contests between compressive and expansive forces, which is seen every day when a rash boiler-master tries the strength of his machine beyond what it will endure, and the fragments fly in thunder about his head, unless grace is given him to spy some symptoms of coming failure, and ease the pressure before it is too late.

The conclusion, after a catastrophe of such a nature, is always that it would have been much better not to have ridden the high horse of too much confidence in apparent power; and that unfortunate above all men is he who finds himself introduced by accident to the charge of dangerous elements, and has not the wit to ask the advice of any but those who are waiting for the ruin of the whole concern.

T. PERRONET THOMPSON.

LETTER FROM MRS. GAGE.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR,—In a late issue you gave a part of the great speech of B. Gratz Brown on the suffrage question, and justly decided that, though long, it was too good to be any of it omitted. Please find enclosed another part of that speech, which many of your readers will feel, I think, is quite as good and as much to the point as some other parts of his good speech.

And, by the way, can any one tell us why the great advocates of Human Equality, such men as Wendell Phillips and Wm. L. Garrison, who a few years ago were bold champions for equality before the law for women, and gave eloquent lectures in behalf of the sex—more than one-half of the people of the United States, oppressed by unjust laws and partial legislation—now wholly ignore that part of the subject, and forget that once when they were a weak party and needed all the womanly strength of the nation to help them on, they always united the words "without regard to sex, race, or color?" Who ever hears of sex now from any of these champions of freedom?

Are the four or five millions of hard working women at the North, whose half-priced labor reduces them almost to the dead line of starvation, of no account? Will the two millions of emancipated women of the South be fully protected against the cruel practices of their old tyrants by giving a vote only to male citizens?

Every day we hear arguments in favor of negro suffrage, urged on the ground that he has held the bayonet during this last war. Have the women of the North done nothing to help the nation forward to its present position? Have they who gave husbands and sons time, money, strength, health—all that makes life desirable for their country, no claim to broader privilege? Is it so unjust for a colored man to work for poor wages, such as voting landowners or capitalists may compel, and yet no injustice to women? Is taxation without representation tyranny to them and not to us? Will some one please to answer these questions, and also please to tell us how it is possible for such unprincipled, reckless men as we sometimes hear described by silver-tongued orators to be just to any class of community? And please tell us, while you are about it, why justice to *all* is not better for a nation and a people than injustice to the majority. The negro men of Paris Island insisted (the smartest and most knowing ones) that the money for the women's labor should be paid over to the husband instead of to the laborer herself. Because, "you know, missus, de womans he have short sense, and don' know how to spend it. (Very much like white folks you see.)

N.B.—My sense is *too short* to see the justice of some of the arguments I read in these days of majestic enthusiasm for liberty with woman left out.

FRANCES D. GAGE.

Lambertville, N. J.

[The following is the extract referred to above:]

Assuming the general ground of the inherent rightfulness of universal suffrage, for it follows as, of course, from individual suffrage, it will not be amiss to say something here in regard to that retort which is held as conclusive against it by so many. I allude to the right of suffrage as appertaining to women and children. To give the objection its greatest force, it may be said: "If suffrage be the right of all men, why is it not also the right of all women—of all children?" "Are they not equally interested in good government, and are they not equally capable of expressing through a vote their wish in relation to public affairs?" "Do not they come within the category, the equal liberty of each limited by the like liberty of all; and, if so, can the infringement of their liberty by disfranchisement be justified?"

To such questions, and in fact to the whole inquiry, it may be replied that as freedom finds the expression of its limits in the social relation itself, so long as the marital and paternal state remain as they are now, essential parts of that social relation, so long will there be more or less of constraint involved in their expression through governmental forms. And it may be added also, that in so far as marriage and paternity establish an identity of interest between husband and wife, or parent and child, so far the participation of the one in the goverment is virtually the participation of both—the franchise of one the franchise of both. Such identity is not always true or equable, but it nevertheless approximates truth, and is therefore the more readily accepted as such in practical affairs. That the rights of women are intrinsically the same with those of men, may not be consistently denied; and that all the advance of modern civilization has been toward according them greater equality of condition, is attested by the current history of every nation within its pale. Rights of married women and minors are constantly finding new expression in our laws and new force in our public opinion—which is only law in process of formation. Whilst it will not be necessary, therefore, to go into those deeper and anterior questions of social life, involving the substitution of voluntary for compulsory modes, which are agitating so profoundly the intellect of this age, it is important to note that of the three great departments of control in human affairs, namely: morals or conscience, manners or society, government or laws—the two former have been unreservedly conceded to the full and equal participation of women. And furthermore, I venture to affirm, with all confidence, that although the social relation, as it embraces a recognition of family dependence, may present obstacles to an equal influence under present forms of government and to the full exercise of citizens' rights on the part of women—yet that the purity, the refinement, the instinctive reading of character, the elegant culture of the women of our land, if brought to bear upon the conduct of political affairs, would do much to elevate them in all their aims, and conform them to higher standards of justice. Nor is this a theme deserving only the sneer of the vulgar, or the coarse irony of the more brutal part of mankind. The participation of women, to a certain extent, in civil affairs, is neither a new nor an uncommon experiment. An accomplished lady who has given much thought and research to this subject has presented an interesting summary of facts in a late publication which it would be discourteous here to pass without notice. She says:

"Ladies of birth and quality sat in the Saxon witas. In Wighfred's great council at Beconceld, in 694, the abbesses sat and delliberated, and five of them signed its decrees. King Edgar's charters, in 961, were signed by nobles and abbesses alike. In Henry the Third's and Edward the First's time, four abbesses were summoned to Parliament. In the time of Edward Third, ten abbesses were summoned to appear, as they chose, in person or by proxy.

"So long as political power was of an absolute and hereditary character, women shared it whenever they happened, by birth, to hold the posit on to which it was attached. In Hungary, in some of the German States, and in the French provinces to this day, certain women holding an inherited right confer the franchise upon their husbands, and in widowhood empower some relative or accredited agent to be the legislative protector of her property. In 1858 the *Stockholm Aftonblad*, a newspaper, stated that the authorities of the old university town of Upsal had granted the right of suffrage to fifty women owning real estate, and to thirty-one doing business on their own account. The representative that their votes elected, was to sit in the house of burgesses. In Scotland, it is less than a century since, for election purposes, parties were unblushingly married in cases where women conveyed a political franchise, and parted after the election. In Ireland, the court of queen's bench, Dublin, restored to a woman, in January, 1864, the old right of voting for town commissioners. The justice, Fitzgerald, desired to state that ladies were also entitled to sit as town commissioners, as well as to vote for them, and the chief-justice took pains to make it clear that there was nothing in the act of voting repugnant to their habits. In November, 1864, the government of Moravia decided that all women who were tax-payers had the right to vote. In the government of Pitcairn's Island, women over sixteen have voted ever since its settlement. In Canada, in 1850, a distinct electoral privilege was conferred on women, in the hope that hereby the Protestant might balance the Roman Catholic power in the school system. I lived where I saw this right exercised by female property-holders for four years. I never heard the most cultivated man, not even that noble gentleman, the late Lord Elgin, object to its results. In New Jersey, the constitution adopted in 1776 gave the right of suffrage to all inhabitants, of either sex, who possessed fifty dollars in proclamation money. In 1790, it made it clearer; the assembly inserted the words, 'he or she.' Women voted there till 1798, when the votes of some colored women decided an election, the prejudice against the negro came to the aid of lordly supremacy, and an act was passed limiting the right of suffrage to 'free white male citizens.' In 1893 the Kentucky legislature conferred the right on widows with children in matters relating to the school system. The same right was conferred in Michigan; and full suffrage was given to women in the State constitution submitted to Kansas in 1859."

In addition to this very graphic recital, showing how often the presumed obstacles to any exercise of civil functions by women have given way before public opinion—and how futile therefore it is as a retort against universal suffrage, it may be interesting to cite the latest development in this behalf. In Australia they have adopted a system of permitting women to vote in all municipal elections; and in the colony of Victoria, by an oversight, the laws of municipal voting were prescribed for the larger and more important election of Parliament. The result was that the entire female population were found participating in the vote. Of this phenomenon the London *Times* thus discourses:

"The women seem to have availed themselves in considerable numbers of the privilege thus obtained. It is recorded that the women voted at least as wisely as the men; that they generally voted for the best educated candidate; that they showed contempt for the secresy of the ballot; and that, espousing the cause which they took up with a heartiness and devotion incidental to the female character, they generally gave plumpers for the candidate of their choice. In a franchise so low as that enjoyed by the Australian colonies, we can easily believe that this new element, especially as the female votes were given in respect of property, would be a marked improvement."

OUR EVERYTHING.

"To bring back the States without Negro Suffrage. To that the President makes everything else bend. We, therefore, on the other hand, demand that everything shall bend to the purpose of keeping them out until Negro Suffrage is secured."

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR,—The *Times* of Saturday criticizes the above extract from THE STANDARD of last week, and seems to think our demand too comprehensive as opposed to the "everything" of the President.

On all sides we hear these questions put and in every variety of form:

"Would you sacrifice so much for a few negroes?

"Would you waste all the blood and treasure thus freely poured out to so small a purpose?

"Would you sacrifice our glorious Union, our mighty nation, to such a narrow idea?"

What is the idea these few negroes represent in our political revolution? What is that to which we say "everything" socially, civilly and politically must bend?

It is the grandest question of national interest ever up for discussion—greater far, than canal tolls, railroads, banks, commerce, free trade, the restoration of a rotten aristocracy, or the reconstruction of a few rebellious States.

Our "everything" consists of the inalienable rights of man, the true natural condition of man himself, and not the regulation merely of his labor, property, locomotion and transient modes of life.

As I read that editorial of the *Times* I thought of a grand scene that occurred not long since in domestic life.

A bankrupt merchant returning home one night, said to his noble wife, "My dear, I am ruined; everything we have is in the hands of the Sheriff."

After a few moments of silence the wife looked calmly into his face and said:

"Will the Sheriff sell you?" Oh! no! "Will the Sheriff sell me?" Oh! no! "Will the Sheriff sell the children?" Oh! no! "Then do not say we have lost everything. All that is most valuable remains to us, manhood, womanhood, childhood. We have lost but the results of our skill and industry. We can make another fortune if our hearts and hands are left us."

Thus say we to the President: Save the man intact and we can easily make another Union that can never be dissolved. With justice for a cement, our Republic must stand forever and ever, linked by an immutable law to the throne of God.

E. C. S.

LETTER FROM REV. CALVIN FAIRBANK.

DANSVILLE, N. Y., Oct. 30, 1865.

To the Editor of the Standard:

SIR,—"The last straw breaks the camel's back." The last pang severs the last hold on life, and leaves the body lifeless. After long struggling and toil, amidst opposition, with great sacrifice and peril, tenaciously holding on to the brightest thread of truth, and watching with faith in results—faith in the integrity of the votaries of long acknowledged truth, the first defection wounds the apostle of freedom; the second, and the third, and the fourth, "paltering with a double sense," inflict anew the wound; but buckling on a double armor, and remembering darker days, the Christian in the cause of humanity marches again to the good fight of freedom.

Who expected of Blair anything but backsliding? he was never the friend of humanity. We had some hope of Andy Johnson, for he said he would be the "Moses" of the unfortunate negro. One year ago, after the election of Mr. Lincoln to the Presidency the second time by near half a million majority, nearly the whole Republican press called for the enfranchisement of the negro. It was so last Spring.

Here, at "Our Home," at Dansville, on the side of a bold hill overlooking the beautiful valley of the Canaseraga, are 180 earnest, anxious, thoughtful, patriotic hearts, that have been pulsating for the "good time coming," and asking the "Watchmen, what of the night?" Here grace abounds, by a hygienic combination of means and life forces, for the healing of the sick, and keeping the health of the healthy. But we have been looking for the health of the Government. The patient was convalescent. Six thousand doctors were treating her, and all wanted the credit, to come into power. The patient gains too slowly; artistic skill administers physical internal stimulants to create another abnormal state, and death is "victorious." Parson Brownlow proposes expatriation to the American hero. So does Blair. Johnson will do anything: "Sink the negro sixty fathoms deep to save the Union." Let him vote? Yes—no; either way. We expected to give him as good a chance in the country as we were to give rebels; as good a chance as any who, "in an hour of great weakness, committed themselves to the cause of the rebellion;" who "conscientiously believed in the cause of the South;" and then "conducted themselves with no unnecessary violence;" so "modest, quiet, honorable." Who thought the champions of freedom, who had stirred so many thousand hearts to their work, making Plymouth Church glow with the spirit and power of Republicanism, could have resuscitated so rapidly in the atmosphere of the times, graduating at the feet of Ben Wood?

How the heart of the earnest patriot sinks—left to fight it over again! Connecticut and Wisconsin lost by cowardice. One post deserted after another. If this is not speedily redeemed, "the South is victorious."

CALVIN FAIRBANK.

SCHUYLER COLFAX ON THE PRESIDENT'S POLICY.

MR. COLFAX was serenaded on Saturday evening last in Washington, and made an elaborate speech. The *Evening Post, Tribune* and indeed all the Radical papers seem to rejoice in it as a satisfactory announcement of the plan of reconstruction which will meet the approval of all reasonable men, in Congress and elsewhere. To the President's terms, Mr. Colfax adds as follows and thus disposes of the question of negro suffrage, as with a whiff of his cigar, and the race are to be called "no more FREEDMEN, but *free* men!" Well does the *Tribune* assure us that "Mr. Colfax is no *fanatic* nor *negro worshipper!*" but here is the extract:

But there are other terms on which, I think, there is no division among the loyal men of the Union. First, that the Declaration of Independence must be recognized as the law of the land, and every man, alien and native, white and black, protected in the inalienable and God-given rights of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." Mr. Lincoln in that Emancipation Proclamation, which is the proudest wreath in his chaplet of fame (cheers), not only gave freedom to the slave, but declared that the Government would maintain that freedom. (Applause.) We cannot abandon them and leave them defenceless at the mercy of their former owners. They must be protected in their rights of person and property, and these freemen must have the right to sue in courts of justice for all just claims, and to testify also, so as to have security against outrage and wrong. I call them *freemen* not *freedmen*. The last phrase might have answered before their freedom was fully secured, but they should be regarded now as freemen of the republic. (Loud and enthusiastic cheers.)

Commenting at much length on the speech of Mr. Colfax, the New York *Herald* with great truth doubtless puts the case as it affects the two political parties thus giving its own sage opinion at the close:

Mr. Colfax does not enter upon the question of negro suffrage directly. He evidently preferred waiting to see how this question will be treated by the President and Congress. This we take as an indication that the majority of the Conservative Republicans will not be disposed to insist upon negro universal suffrage. They will probably go with President Johnson, and leave this matter to the States, as it is left to the several loyal States of the North, provided the principle or dogma of civil rights be recognized in some way. And in the same manner, perhaps, some of the members from the South who may come with a clean record may be admitted after the President shows his hand and the subject is ventilated.

The Republican party—the party in power—does not care so much about the negro after all; and it is not for his sake so much that they claim the suffrage for him. It is a question of political power. They are afraid the votes of the Southern members and people may be used against them, and they think the negro vote would neutralize that. This, however, is a short-sighted view of the case; for it is more likely the Southerners would control the suffrages of the negroes than the Northerners. We are inclined to think it would be a temporary political advantage to the Southerners. But the consequences in the end of universal negro suffrage, or anything approaching it, would be disastrous to the South and injurious to the whole country.

THE SOUTH AND THE NEGROES.

NORTH CAROLINA.

THE ELECTION—STUMP SPEECHES IN RALEIGH.

Correspondence of the New York Times.

RALEIGH, Wednesday, Nov. 8, 1865.

Two of the candidates for the House of Commons, Hon. Kenneth Rayner and Hon. B. F. Moore, both of them supporters of Gov. HOLDEN, addressed a mass-meeting last evening at the court-house in Raleigh, and what they said is interesting, in view of their high position and influence, and as a fair sample of public opinion.

It was noteworthy that both of these gentlemen laid the responsibility of the war constantly upon the fire-eaters of the Southern States, whose talk had been "nigger, nigger, nigger, and nigger everlastingly," while only a single allusion was made to the co-operation of the "red-mouthed fanatics of the North." Nothing was said of the South being driven into the war, or fighting against her will.

Mr. Rayner reviewed his own public course, and after declaring himself the best Union man in the State, avowed that when an appeal was made to arms, he did desire that the South should conquer the North. (Applause.) He had been in favor of the Union, *because he thought it the best guarantee to slavery.* He was proud of his "devotion to the Union and his loyalty to his section."

In regard to the negroes, "either we must destroy them or they will destroy us, or we must have miscegenation and cover this land with half-breeds, or we must colonize them." The latter was, of course, the chosen alternative, "and it is practicable, if the Government will only try. The United States can accomplish everything it undertakes. I was convinced of that when I saw Sherman's army march through Raleigh. (Laughter.)" But colonization will take time, and for the present we must have stringent laws for the regulation of the blacks. *To allow them to testify in courts is not to be thought of.* They are not capable of telling the truth. Who would have it so that the reputation of a wife or daughter should be tarnished by a nigger's testimony?

Mr. Moore who is a lawyer and the chairman of the committee to prepare a code for the freedmen, to be reported to the next Legislature, agreed with the previous speaker as to the wretchedness of the present condition. Now who would not rather be tried by a jury of his fellow-citizens than by four or five military men who are not acquainted with civil law, and where the evidence of the negro is taken against one? Think of poor Markham, who has just been sentenced to twelve months' hard labor in Fort Pulaski, after he had been waiting in suspense in jail for six months before trial, for killing a negro who had stolen a mule from him, and kept insulting and taunting him every time they met, he riding about on the stolen animal. Any jury, if they could not acquit him entirely, would have felt that the time he had spent in jail was punishment enough for what almost any one would have done in the same circumstances. Now, we can't have good order with such divided jurisdiction. Five thousand niggers would not injure my reputation nor that gentleman's. I want this Nigger Bureau taken away. But notice, I am not in favor of negro evidence. "In my report I shall, so far as I can, exclude their evidence from the courts of justice." As to their being in the jury box, that, of course, can't be allowed.

On the topic of negro suffrage Mr. Moore narrated a conversation which he had with Chief-Justice Chase at Wilmington last summer. The point of his argument on that occasion was that, as before the war, the laws of Ohio refused suffrage to full-blooded negroes, and the Justice admitted that he would not have changed the basis, if he had the power, against the will of the people, he ought to show the same respect to the feelings and prejudices of the people here.

The orator also described the character of Andrew Johnson, with whom he had had several conferences in regard to reconstruction. "I know his character better than he knows himself. He is a self-willed man and one bound to have his own way. If you oppose him, he will oppose you. I wanted to have him suffer our Legislature to assemble and call a convention in the Constitutional way for amending the Constitution, but he refused to." "You have no Legislature." I asked him to alter some of the clauses in the amnesty proclamation which he was about to issue, and which he did me the honor to read to me. I urged this modification and that, until at last he exclaimed: "I am a good mind not to offer any amnesty at all, but to leave you all under condemnation." I am sure that Andy Johnson is our best friend and means to do us all the good he can, but he has to sustain himself at the North and we must judge him accordingly.

Mr. Moore further advocated the continuance of the stay-law, and the enactment of a just bankrupt law.

The statements of the two candidates have thus been given in substantially their own language. I have heard more liberal and humane sentiments expressed by some gentlemen in private, but nowhere from the stump. The best public men seem timid and afraid of the prejudices of the uneducated. In regard to loyalty, all classes of politicians are proud that they went with their State against the Union. The original advocates of secession appear to be nowhere. All the scores or hundreds of whites whom I have heard speak of it, were opposed to the war from the beginning, but not one seemed to feel that there was any more guilt in fighting against the United States after the war began, than there would have been against England. Loyalty is a plant of too slow growth to gain much root in six months.

UNION.

MISSISSIPPI.

THE FREEDMEN—ARROGANCE OF THE REBELS—THEY ARREST AN OFFICER OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY—THE LEGISLATURE AND THE NEGRO QUESTION—LOYALTY.

Correspondence of the Chicago Republican.

JACKSON, Miss., October 30, 1865.

The rebels are fast returning to their homes in Mississippi, and coming back with the same bitter feeling toward everything that pertains to the North and to the Government, that they had before and during the war; only now their animosity extends further, and embraces the negro as well as the Yankee. The fire still smoulders in the volcano, though it seems to be extinct, while gathering strength and fury for a more destructive outbreak.

THE NEGROES.

The freedmen are shy of offers of employment from their old masters, and like many other men, are loth to work without wages. They posses strong sensibilities. The idea is common among the blacks in the interior of the State that Government is going to divide the land among them, that they may work it for themselves.

ARROGANCE OF THE REBELS.

The planters are growing insolent and daring, and not long ago they ventured so far as to arrest an officer of the United States Army. This is the first use made of the Mississippi militia. Capt. Peck was stationed at Hazlehurst as sub-commissioner of the Freedmen's Bureau, and was engaged in the performance of his duty, when a Mississippian insulted him in his own office. The captain, after bearing his insolence as long as he could, ordered him out of the room. The man refused to go, and had to be dragged out by the guard. For this the sheriff came down with his posse of militia, arrested Capt. Peck, and lodged him in jail.

He had no sooner done it than his heart failed him. He offered to release the prisoner on bail, but, to his dismay, the captain refused to go free on such terms. The sheriff tried coaxing, but Capt. Peck stood firm.

He was treated with every consideration, and was again offered his liberty if he would give his parole not to pass the limits of the town; but he disdained to receive his liberty as a favor! His captors were much in the same predicament as the man who drew the elephant in the lottery, and their only anxiety was to get rid of him, when Gen. Osterhaus came to their aid by sending four negro companies to release the captain, and arrest the sheriff, militia, and all concerned in the affair. It was done, and we now await the consequences.

THE LEGISLATURE AND THE NEGROES.

The legislature is now in session, and considering the main question of the hour, what to do with the negro? The chairman of the committee of the convention appointed to prepare a Code suited to the new state of things, was heard to say that they would indeed protect the freedmen, but would also make them work, and at the same time hold them as nearly as possible to their old condition; that no contract should be made for freedmen's labor for less than a year, and the vagrant laws should be made so severe that any negro found without employment, or away from the plantation without a pass, should be taken up and hired out, *nolens volens*, to the highest bidder. It was thought that the days when passes were needed by the negro were gone! Shall they be brought back in this subtle way?

LOYALTY.

These Southerners are not loyal—no matter how many are pardoned. Is it an evidence of loyalty on the part of the Mississippi legislature to debate two hours and a half whether they should raise the Union flag over the house in which they hold their sessions? One man opposed it long and earnestly; "for," said he, "my two sons fell fighting against it, and I do not want to see it floating above our heads in triumph." It was decided to raise it, however, but mainly from motives of policy.

Thus do the currents and undercurrents of expression and feeling flow opposingly against and contradict each other. What you hear at the North is simply the surface current of words; but beneath, the stronger current of feeling surges back again like the breakers on the beach. The waves come rolling in, while, stronger and unseen, the undertow sweeps back again to the sea. So do the honeyed words of these unsubdued traitors roll out with hypocritical grace, while the undercurrent of their real feeling flows treacherously back toward secession and slavery.

HAMPDEN.

Special Correspondence of Tribune.

VICKSBURG, Oct. 30, 1865.

It is not strange that the North should be confused by various accounts of the actual state of things in the South. One simple principle would conduct them out of this labyrinth of confusion. Find the standpoint of the writer, and you will readily guess what coloring his views would take. Is he a pardon-seeker?—then look for the rosy hues of Southern peace and acquiescence which will furnish reason to expect the pardon he desires. Is he a negro philanthropist?—then look out for views of the actual sufferings of the freedmen. If he is a Democratic politician—then expect to see the horrors of "nigger equality!" If a Republican—then see how wide is the straddle of his dilemma! If he arrays facts against a Republican President, that seems suicidal. If he leaves out the facts, and the Union is reconstructed of the rottenness of Southern loyalty, then how much better is the suicide by omission than by commission—by riving the party, or rotting it!

The South surrendered because they could not help it. They accept the Government, because they must. They abolish slavery, since, otherwise, it is defunct beyond all possibility of salvation, and without this abolition they remain subjugated beyond all hope of recuperation, and they want to be a power in the Government, since they must live under it; so they call conventions, create legislatures, enact laws that enable them to reach these ends, and beyond this they go not, in this direction, even one-half inch. They do this, but they hate it. They are loyal to necessity, not to the Government. They admit this themselves. They sometimes even boast of it. Mr. M. comes home from Washington; he has seen the President, "the greatest statesman of the age," or any age; the President offered him a pardon, asked him what else he would have, got his property back, etc. Now, he says, "the President is all right," and "we are all right," and "it only remains to kill off the Republican party," and the country is all right. These are facts; this is what he says coming right from the White House. I do not suppose that this is the policy of the President; but it is strongly significant, that nearly all who come back from this errand to Washington talk just as he does. This is not a programme that we make up. We simply record what is made. Thus man advocates peace and harmony in utterances mingled with the gall of secession hatred. The only thing that such men hate worse than a nigger (a free nigger, of course,) is a Yankee. How they treat the freedmen is a chapter by itself. They do not hate him because he is black, for they miscegenate with them, sleep with them, do everything with them but love them; of course all their pretended dread of amalgamation and nigger equality is the merest bosh, and whoever has seen the complexions of Southern freedmen, and questions this, is a hypocrite.

But they "accept emancipation." How do they accept it? Their actual treatment of the black must answer? Within 40 days after the first start to organize the Freedmen's Bureau, more than 25 men had been arrested for gross outrages on this people. About one half of these were taken for shooting negroes. Some were arrested for cutting off the ears of those who ran away from old masters as they had a right to do! The others were guilty of gross abuses of the people. Who has heard of any punishment of *any one* of these ruffians? Since that time many other cases have come to our knowledge. But no one need to suppose that a tithe of the cases are ever heard of at all beyond their own neighborhood, or that in one-fourth of those reported the culprits can be detected and arrested. Within the last three weeks, *nine five or six murderous assaults* have been made on the freedmen in three adjoining counties, while only three arrests have been made, and twice as many have escaped. At the Prentiss House Hospital in Vicksburg, a girl was received from Yazoo City by the name of Mary Jones. She had been "paddled" until her back and legs were raw, and beaten on the head till she was senseless. It was a shocking case of cruelty, and understood to be of her former owner's inflicting. She was in the hospital two or three weeks. Other facts can be obtained by reference to the hospital records and the surgeons attending.

William Ward, from Yazoo County, 30 miles from Jackson, came to the hospital nearly dead from injuries inflicted. He was a member of the Presbyterian Church. The surgeon thought that his old master was also, but was not certain of this.

He had been worth $1,500 before the war; was working—as many do this year—for subsistence; was sent to the field to plow, and sat down on the ground. Soon, "old master" came out to the field, and with him his brother, each with a large stick or cudgel. The servant was asked why he was not plowing, and answered that he was sick and was not able. He was, thereupon, "set on" by the old master (his brother standing by) and beaten unmercifully. His hands were broken and mangled by this continued violence. His back was scored; and in this condition—after time and inflammation had aggravated his cruel wounds—he came to the hospital, and told his story to the surgeon on his dying bed, with every appearance of truthfulness and honesty. He died the second week of his stay in the hospital, receiving every care and alleviation that his case required. Who that has given to the Freedmen's Hospitals will regret the outlay that mitigated the distresses of those who fell among thieves?

Another case, in the same hospital, showing the spirit that freedmen often encounter, was that of Sarah Ann, from Yazoo City. Her master's name was Shellcote. Her husband was beaten with a stick by him, two years ago, and chained up, and from these severities he died the next night. The occasion of such cruelty was only the old owner's dislike of escaping slaves. A year ago she too was beaten and driven off, and reached the hospital at length. She showed us the injuries then received and still apparent. In another ward was a man lately shot by guerrillas without provocation. His arm was broken. He came seven or eight weeks ago. His old master brought him to the hospital.

A few nights ago a man was shot while going quietly to the wood-yard at "Four-Mile Bridge." He escaped and came to the hospital severely wounded.

Just below Vicksburg, Mrs. Dr. Gibbs has returned to her abandoned plantation, where, in order to get possession of the crops raised by negro leasees, who obtained the land of the Government, and pay the Government for it, she attempted to frighten the freedmen away with a pistol—threatening their lives. She "would show them whose land it was."

The motive for this violence is patent to all. If she succeeded in frightening them away, she would get the entire crop which they had already made, and also vent her rebel spleen on the darkies. During the war two negroes escaped from this same plantation and were impressed into Government service by Gen. Grant—not unwillingly, for they stole away from camp at night and tried to bring their wives away to the Union lines. In their effort to do this they were discovered, caught and punished, by flogging, being "staked down" in order to be whipped, and then burned, in addition to the merciless lashing.

It is impossible to exaggerate the barbarisms of slavery in the masters, or the barbarities it inflicts on its victims. It is no more to be hoped that compulsory emancipation will change the spirit or the habits of this people at once than that the Ethiopian will change his skin, or the leopard either his spots or his cruel tastes. Shall the freedmen be left to the tender mercies of these maddened tyrants—the frightened sheep to the angry, hungry wolves? I heard it said in Central Mississippi, and approved by the auditors, that "emancipation is robbery," and that the United States is the greatest robber in the world.

From intercourse with hundreds in the interior, I can say, of personal knowledge, that this is the *common* sentiment of the people.

I do not exhaust my record of facts. I give samples. I reserve the worst atrocities, especially insulting to the Government, for another letter.

OBSERVER.

NEW ORLEANS, November 18.

The Mississippi House has partly revised its refusal to allow negro testimony against whites. It has now passed, 47 to 43, the following law in addition to the cases in which freedmen, free negroes, and mulattoes are now by law competent witnesses: In all cases in which they who offer themselves as witnesses shall be a party to a record, and in which they shall be parties, both plaintiffs and defendants, and in all criminal cases in which the offense charged was committed against the person or property of the freedman, free negro, or mulatto, so offered as a witness; provided no freedman, free negro, or mulatto shall be examined as a witness in any case whatever only upon the stand and in open court. The Senate will probably adjust this section.

SOUTHERN POSTMISTRESSES.—Large numbers of women have been appointed postmistresses at the South, on account of the inability of men to take the required oath

A BOOK FOR THE FREEDMEN.

To the Editor of the Anti-Slavery Standard.

I HAVE just published a book for the emancipated slaves, entitled "The Freedmen's Book." The service is entirely gratuitous on my part, and by the kind assistance of Ticknor & Fields I am enabled to furnish the freedmen with the books at the mere expense of paper, printing, and binding.

Though prepared expressly for them, and carefully adapted to their degree of education, it is calculated to diminish prejudice against color at the North, and thus to promote just views on the suffrage question. It is 1 vol. of nearly 300 pages, and will be sold to all except the freedmen at the usual price of books of that size, in order to defray necessary expenses.

L. MARIA CHILD.

THE JAMAICA INSURRECTION.

WHERE IS THE DIFFERENCE?—In a single parish in Jamaica, says the Boston *Transcript*, a portion of an ignorant and oppressed people rebelled against the authorities and perpetrated great atrocities. They have been subdued and have met with a terrible retribution. In this country leading public men entered into a conspiracy to destroy our nationality, inaugurated a gigantic civil war, without any real cause, and only in obedience to their own exacting ambition and obstinate and blind passions. Under their conduct of the insurrection, brutalities and murders that savages would shudder at, were systematically committed. Their crime exceeded by ten thousand fold that of the maddened negroes in the West Indies. But it is said that magnanimity demands that they be treated with clemency. Perhaps it does. But justice demands that the black insurgents should not be denounced as fiends and the white insurgents restored to their old places of power or granted new opportunities for the renewal of their machinations. It is the color of the soul—not of the skin—that makes the traitor.

So far the *Transcript*. The New York *Tribune* questions emphatically the whole account so far as relates to the difficulties being an insurrection among the colored people. It says:

Our advices received by the steamer from Jamaica yesterday show that deplorable as are the excesses which were committed by an infuriated mob when the outbreak occurred, the affair was not what it has been represented, viz: a concerted movement among the Blacks all over the island to exterminate the Whites and the Browns, and to make themselves masters of the country. The outbreak was confined to one single parish out of the twenty-two parishes into which the island is divided, and did not extend even over the whole of that district. In fact, it is described by the Jamaica *Guardian* of the 13th inst., in giving an account of its incidents, not as a rebellion of the Blacks but as "riot and bloodshed in St. Thomas-in-the-East." That this outbreak is not a negro rebellion got up for the extermination of the Whites seems clear, from the fact that the Maroons, who are all blacks, have rendered loyal and valuable service in capturing the insurgents, and defending the persons and property of the planters; and other blacks, not belonging to that class of people, have done the same. And, even so far as the particular parish in which the outbreak occurred is concerned, it seems strange that the Blacks, if intending a massacre of the other inhabitants, should have gone to work as they did—that is, have given what was equivalent to a warning of their intentions, whereby the authorities were enabled to have a military force on the spot to suppress the outbreak. From all we can gather, it appears to us that this outbreak, which was local in its character, arose mainly from local causes peculiar to the district in which it took place. Taking into account the peaceful character, loyalty and obedience to the laws, by which the Blacks of Jamaica have been distinguished ever since their emancipation, it will require evidence of the most explicit and decisive character to support the charge brought against them in this matter. That evidence has not yet appeared; and, without wishing to prejudge the case, we may say we do not think it will ever be supplied.

IMPARTIAL SUFFRAGE.—A "National Equal Suffrage Association" has been organized at Washington City. S. J. Bowen, President; Lewis Clephane, Vice-President; A. M. Gangewer, Corresponding Secretary. Its founders say in their Report:

"Since the suppresion of the Rebellion a great work is to be done in order to secure its fruits to the heirs of the brave men who achieved the victory. Many thousands of colored men residing in the South, destitute in great part of enlightened education, but loyal to the country, are anxious to exalt her interests and secure their own welfare by exercising the right of suffrage. Shall they be denied this privilege?

"Sincerely believing the great doctrine enunciated in our Declaration of Independence, that all 'men are created equal, and that they are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness,' and that the preamble to the Constitution of the United States declares the purpose for which it was ordained, we hold that our liberties will be best secured by equal and impartial suffrage, the granting to every man of suitable age, guiltless of crime, the right to vote. We affirm this to be our deliberate conviction, not hastily or inconsiderately formed; but, while thus declaring, knowing the prejudice in many minds against granting this privilege to ignorant men, should there be any who favor only a qualified or partial suffrage to men who may in their opinion have attained sufficient education to exercise it intelligently, we will gladly cooperate with them in advocating a limited grant, as a step in the right direction. Any restriction, however, should be made to all classes of citizens alike, and not to men of any particular color or nationality. It is well known that our lamented President Lincoln favored the extension of the privilege to intelligent colored men, and, had he lived, he would doubtless have endeavored to secure its adoption.

"Republican institutions should be founded on the virtue and intelligence of the people, and, in establishing a basis which shall be firm and enduring, the rights of all men should be respected and recognized. The spirit of caste should be frowned down, and the effort to establish a privileged class rebuked. Equal rights, equal laws, virtue, education, intelligence. Let these be established; let each man be willing to grant to every other man the rights and privileges which he claims for himself, then shall our country occupy a proud preeminence among the nations of the earth. Our land shall become the home of the oppressed of all nations, and the blessings of Him who is 'no respecter of persons,' but who 'hath made of one blood all nations of men to dwell on the face of the whole earth,' will descend upon us and upon our children. To aid, however feebly, in securing the triumph of justice thus indicated, is our aim."

SUMMARY.

THE Richmond *Enquirer* considers that "the Constitutional Amendment has not been adopted because the people of Virginia will not consent to give Congress the right to legislate [for] and control any part of her people." The *Tribune* thinks another reason may be that Congress has not yet given Virginia the right to legislate for and control any part of the United States.

THE Columbus (Ga.) *Sun* indulges in the following:

"Preparations have now been completed to have a chain-gang of the idle negroes found in Columbus. All colored people, who have no visible means of support, are to have a ball and chain attached to them, and set to work at levelling the fortifications around the city, the city to feed them the while. It is the determination of both the civil and military authorities that no idlers, who can only exist by pilfering and robbery, will be allowed to remain in the city, unless they can be forced to earn their bread. Some eight are to be put to work this morning."

A SAD DISAPPOINTMENT.—The rebels of Washington were highly elated last night over the report that a negro regiment stationed in town had mutinied, and were indiscriminately massacreing the people in the upper part of the city. They were afterward greatly disappointed to learn that a miniature row between some members of the 4th Regulars and 7th Veterans Reserve Corps, had taken place, and that the colored troops were innocent of any participation in the affair.

THE DIAMOND DRILL.—The diamond drill, originally patented in France by M. Rudolph Leschaud, and subsequently patented in the United States, can be driven through compact sandstone at the rate of five feet per hour. Fifteen diamonds, costing about fifteen hundred dollars, are used instead of steel cutters, and are set in the end of a tube made to revolve by machinery. The drill leaves a core standing, which is broken off at convenient lengths and drawn up. These diamond cutters last a long time, and the machine is said to be the cheap

Miscellaneous Department.

A VOICE FROM ACADEME.

BY ROBERT BUCHANAN.

Over this azure poplar glade
The sunshine, fainting high above,
Ebbs back from woolly clouds that move
Like browsing lambs and cast no shade;
And straight before me, faintly seen
Thro' emerald boughs that intervene,
The visible sun turns white and weaves
Long webs of silver thro' the leaves.
The grassy sward beneath my foot
Is soft as lips of lambs and beeves.
How cool those lilies at the root
Of yonder tree, that dimly dance
Thro' dews of their own radiance!

Yonder I see the river run,
Half in the shade, half in the sun;
And as I near its rushy brink
The sparkling minnows, where they lie
With silver bellies to the sky,
Flash from me in a shower and sink.
I stand in shadows cool and sweet,
But in the mirror at my feet
The heated azure heavens wink.

All round about this shaded spot,
Whither the sunshine cometh not,
Where all is beautiful repose—
I know the kindled landscape glows;
And further, flutter golden showers
On proud Athenai white with towers,
And catching from the murmurous sea
(Stain'd with deep shadows as of flowers
And dark'ning down to purple bowers
Thro' which the sword-fish darts in glee),
A strife that cometh not to me.

For in this place of shade and sound,
Hid from the garish heat around,
I feel like one removed from strain
And fever of the happy brain—
Where thoughts thrill fiery into pain;
Like one who, in the pleasant shade
The peaceful, pulseless dead have made,
Walking in silence, just perceives
The gaudy world from which he went
Subdue itself to his content,
Like that white globe beyond the leaves!

THE GETTYSBURG HERO.

JOHN BURNS is a stoutish, slightly bent, hale old man, with a light blue eye, a long aggressive nose, a firm-set mouth, expressive of determination of character, and a choleric temperament. His hair, originally dark brown, is considerably bleached with age; and his beard, once sandy, covers his face (shaved once or twice a week) with a fine crop of silver stubble. A short, massy kind of man; about five feet four or five inches in hight, I should judge. He was never measured but once in his life. That was when he enlisted in the war of 1812. He was then 19 years old, and stood five feet in his shoes. "But I've growed a heap since," said the old hero.

He introduced me to his wife, a slow, somewhat melancholy old lady, in ill-health. "She has been poorly now for a good many years." They have no children.

At my request he told me his story. He is of Scotch parentage; and who knows but he may be akin to the plowman poet, whose "arrowy songs still sing in our morning air?" He was born and bred in Burlington, N. J. A shoemaker by trade, he became a soldier by choice, and fought the British in what used to be the last "war." I am afraid he contracted bad habits in the army. For some years after the war he led a wandering and dissipated life. Forty years ago he chanced to find himself in Gettysburg, where he married and settled down. But his unfortunate habits still adhered to him, and he was long looked upon as a man of little worth. At last, however, when there seemed to be no hope of his ever being anything but a despised old man, he took a sudden resolution to reform. The fact that he kept that resolution, and still keeps it so strictly that it is impossible to prevail upon him to taste a drop of intoxicating liquor, attests a truly heroic will. He was afterwards a constable in Gettysburg, in which capacity he served some six years.

On the morning of the first day's fight he sent his wife away, telling her that he would take care of the house. The firing was near by, over Seminary Ridge. Soon a wounded soldier came into the town and stopped at an old house on the opposite corner. Burns saw the poor fellow lay down his musket, and the inspiration to go into the battle seems then first to have seized him. He went over and demanded the gun.

"What are you going to do with it?" asked the soldier.

"I'm going to shoot some of the damned rebels!" replied John.

He is not a swearing man, and the strong adjective is to be taken in a strictly literal, not a profane, sense.

Having obtained the gun, he pushed out on the Chambersburg Pike, and was soon in the thick of the skirmish.

"I wore a high-crowned hat, and a long-tailed blue; and I was seventy years old."

The sight of so old a man, in such costume, rushing fearlessly forward to get a shot in the very front of the battle, of course attracted attention. He fought with the 7th Wisconsin regiment, the colonel of which ordered him back, and questioned him, and finally, seeing the old man's patriotic determination, gave him a good rifle in place of the musket he had brought with him.

"Are you a good shot?"

"Tolerable good," said John, who is an old fox-hunter.

"Do you see that rebel riding yonder?"

"I do."

"Can you fetch him?"

"I can try."

The old man took deliberate aim and fired. He does not say he killed the rebel, but simply that his shot was cheered by the Wisconsin boys, and that afterwards the horse the rebel rode was seen galloping with an empty saddle. "That's all I know about it."

He fought until our forces were driven back in the afternoon. He had already received two slight wounds, and a third one through the arm, to which he paid little attention: "only the blood running down my hand bothered me a heap." Then, as he was slowly falling back with the rest, he received a final shot through the leg. "Down I went, and the whole rebel army ran over me." Helpless, nearly bleeding to death from his wounds, he lay upon the field all night. "About sun-up, next morning, I crawled to a neighbor's house, and found it full of wounded rebels." The neighbor afterwards took him to his own house, which had also been turned into a rebel hospital. A rebel surgeon dressed his wounds; and he says he received decent treatment at the hands of the enemy until a Copperhead woman living opposite "told on him."

"That's the old man who said he was going out to shoot some of the damned rebels!"

Some officers came and questioned him, endeavoring to convict him of "bushwhacking;" but the old man gave them little satisfaction. This was on Friday, the third day of the battle; and he was alone with his wife in the upper part of the house. The rebels left, and soon after two shots were fired. One bullet entered the window, passed over Burns' head, and struck the wall behind the lounge on which he was lying. The other shot fell lower, passing through a door. Burns is certain that the design was to assassinate him. That the shots were fired by the rebels there can be no doubt; and as they were fired from their own side, towards the town, of which they held possession at the time, John's theory was plainly the true one. The hole in the window, and the bullet-marks in the door and wall remain.

Burns went with me over the ground where the first day's fight took place. He showed me the scene of his hot day's work—pointed out two trees, behind which he and one of the Wisconsin boys stood and "picked off every rebel that showed his head," and the spot where he fell and lay all night under the stars and dew.

This act of daring on the part of so aged a citizen, and his subsequent sufferings from wounds, naturally called out a great deal of sympathy, and caused him to be looked upon as a hero. But a hero, like a prophet, has not all honor in his own country. There's a wide-spread, violent prejudice against Burns among that class of the towns-people termed "Copperheads." The young men, especially, who did not take their guns and go into the fight as this old man did, but who ran, when running was possible, in the opposite direction, dislike Burns. Some aver that he did not have a gun in his hand that day, and that he was wounded by accident, happening to get between the two lines. Others admit the fact of his carrying a gun into the fight, but tell you, with a sardonic smile, that his "motives were questionable." Some, who are eager enough to make money on his picture, sold against his will, and without profit to him, will tell you in confidence, after you have purchased it, that "Burns is a perfect humbug."

After studying the old man's character, conversing both with his friends and enemies, and sifting evidence, during four days spent in Gettysburg, I formed my conclusions. Of his going into the fight, and fighting, there is no doubt whatever. Of his bravery, amounting even to rashness, there can be no reasonable question. He is a patriot of the most zealous sort; a hot, impulsive man, who meant what he said, when he started with the gun to go and shoot some of the rebels qualified with the strong adjective. A thoroughly honest man, too, I think; although some of his remarks are to be taken with considerable allowance. His temper causes him to form immoderate opinions and to make strong statements. "He always goes beyant," said my landlord, a firm friend of his, speaking of this tendency to overstep the bounds of calm judgment.

Burns is a sagacious observer of men and things, and makes occasionally such shrewd remarks as this:

"Whenever you see the marks of shell and bullets on a house all covered up, and painted and plastered over, that's the house of a rebel sympathizer; but when you see them all preserved and kept in sight, as something to be proud of, that's the house of a true Union man."

Well, whatever is said or thought of the old hero, he is what he is, and has satisfaction in that, and not in other people's opinions; for so it must finally be with all. Character is the one thing valuable. Reputation, which is a mere shadow of the man, what his character is reputed to be, is, in the long run, of infinitely less importance. I am happy to add that the old man has been awarded a pension.—*J. T. Trowbridge in November Atlantic.*

THE CREDULITY OF SCEPTICS.

From the Saturday Review.

INCREDULES, *les plus crédules*—according to Pascal's very pithy aphorism. People, he says, believe Vespasian's miracles in order that they may cease to believe in the miracles of Moses. Like most other telling retorts, it must be admitted to be almost too good to be true. We are all given to repeat the sayings that a boaster and a bully is always a coward, and that the man who would lift his hand against a woman is such a monster that human language has hitherto been found inadequate to complete the sentence. Yet it is a notorious fact that bullying merely implies an insensibility which is as compatible with courage as with cowardice; at most, it is more naturally allied with the brutal than with the heroic variety of courage; but any one would be very rash who presumed that a prize-fighter who thrashed his wife was incapable of receiving blows as well as administering them. As for bragging, nothing is more conducive to bravery than the inordinate vanity which in some temperaments infallibly generates that vice. Nelson was, if possible, as vain as he was brave; and it would have been entirely out of character for him to give a Frenchman his due. Modesty and merit have a close connection alphabetically, but merit which is independent of a good sturdy self-esteem must be of an unusually tough constitution. In fact, we repeat this kind of commonplace, much as we used to say that murder would out, because it would be so very pleasant if it were founded in fact. We have lately been told, with a good deal of emphasis, that at least one branch of murder almost amounts to a recognized profession. It requires, of course, a good deal of self-possession, or an unusually favorable combination of circumstances, to commit a murder with anything like a certainty of concealment, although, thanks to sensation novels, murder, "considered as a fine art," has lately had such a flood of light thrown upon its principles and practice that it is a pity if it is not brought to a higher pitch of perfection. A lady or gentleman who wishes to get rid of a friend need only refer to one of the leading cases explained in such books as *Lady Audley's Secret*, to find the most judicious method of arranging all the details with a view to at least some years' security. You cannot always push your first husband into a well, and throw stones upon him from the top; nor can you always lock him into a bed-room, and set fire to the house. But it is a pity if you cannot find something corresponding to the circumstances of the particular case, and you have generally the comfort of reflecting that, as a rule, the coincidences by which the murder is ultimately detected are, if anything, more surprising than those by which the commission of the crime is originally favored. Doctrines such as these resemble that by which we were taught in infancy that Providence had placed a shark's mouth far back under his nose in order that he might have to turn in an awkward position before swallowing his victim. Such a very noxious animal as a shark with his mouth in a normal position was considered to be too devilish a contrivance to be permitted to exist, and therefore with the danger there was also provided an effective antidote. The presumed credulity of sceptics is imagined to serve the same kind of purpose. A sceptic who could succeed in disbelieving everything was supposed to be too dangerous a person to be allowed to go about unmuzzled; and therefore, by a judicial blindness, after refusing, like Marmion, to receive for gospel what the Church believed, he was allowed to take a substantial man in armour for a disembodied spirit. The punishment was certainly appropriate. A thorough-going sceptic, boasting his right to reject all that had satisfied the highest intellects, but taken in by a story too gross to impose upon a child, would be a pleasant spectacle for the simple believer. The essential weakness of the very engine of offence upon whose efficacy he most prided himself would be signally exposed. Nor is it to be doubted that there are many cases to be alleged in conformity with the assertion. Voltaire's belief that all the fossil shells supposed to be unimpeachable proofs of the Flood had really been deposited upon the mountains by pilgrims from the Holy Land, used to be one established case to cite. A more striking one is Comte's curious attempt to manufacture a religion from which he had, in consistency, to eliminate all theological ideas. And in the present day we have seen that the nonsense of spirit-rapping, of clairvoyance, and kindred absurdities have often been most readily accepted by people who had endeavored to free themselves from all recognized creeds. There was a gentleman, mentioned somewhere by Boswell, who endeavored to apologize for retaining some superstitions after becoming a professed free-thinker by saying that, although he had come out of the wilderness of Christianity, some of the briars and thorns were still sticking to his clothes. And, putting aside the irreverence of the metaphor, it might certainly happen that a man who retained detached fragments of his former belief, whilst giving up all the grounds upon which they rested, might convert them into very paltry superstitions. The most general case, however, is that in which a man does not preserve old doctrines, but takes up with entirely newfangled ones, of a kind absurd *ab initio*. In this case the common explanation may be taken as at any rate partially true, that a man who refuses to accept the ordinary beliefs of those around him is still in want of some belief to fill the vacuum; he has thrown away the life-buoy, and has to content himself with such support as he can get out of straws.

There are, however, many sceptics who seem to get on without any belief and without any attempt at a substitute. It would doubtless be agreeable to maintain the contrary. It would also, one might have thought, be desirable that a thoroughly selfish man should sooner or later become an unhappy man. Still there are a good many people who, so far as we can see, are thoroughly and remorselessly selfish, and who nevertheless contrive, so long as they have a good digestion, to lead very pleasant lives and make a stomach to some extent supply the place of a heart. Major Pendennis got on very well, except when he deviated sufficiently from his established principles to take an undue interest in his nephew. Now there are certainly sceptics of whom it would be impossible to predicate with certainty that their creed contains any articles whatever beyond those which are necessary to guard their heads from knocking against a post. They seem to exist without feeling the want, common to most men, of having at least some apology for a faith to preserve their mental health. The disease of undue credulity is not one which attacks the whole class indiscriminately. It is only certain varieties who are doomed to give a triumph to their enemies by throwing off the garments of civilized life only to put on the barbaric ornaments of a savage. The explanation seems to be simple. The case of universal, unmitigated scepticism is one which can scarcely be said to occur. Everybody believes, and believes with the same intensity, that two and two make four, and that if equals are added to equals the wholes are equal. A man who did not thus believe would not be a sceptic, but an idiot. It is, indeed, possible for metaphysicians to throw a certain transcendental doubt upon the accuracy of even these first principles, and, like Tucker, to suggest some considerations which seem to throw a doubt upon two and two making four. But a doubt which affects every article of our belief, and not the relative intensity of certain articles of belief, is, for practical purposes, the same thing as no doubt at all. A man acts in every way with exactly the same confidence, whether he holds that mathematical propositions are absolutely and universally true, or whether he holds that there may possibly be other systems of stars where two straight lines manage to enclose a space, and where two equals added together produce unequals, or even where the propositions A is B, and A is not B, may be simultaneously true. The highest kind of certainty of which we are capable is sufficient to exclude all doubt that can ever affect our actions or our reasoning, and it is merely a question of speculative interest what may be the metaphysical value of that certainty. It is only in the next stage of argument that the difference between believers and sceptics commences. One man may hold that the immortality of the soul is as certain as a mathematical truth, and another that it is merely probable, down to any low degree of probability. The main difference between various classes of thinkers then begins to be apparent. There is, for example, a great difference between men in respect of their readiness to receive what may be called the contagion of belief. A very large part of every one's opinions upon almost all matters must be accepted on trust. Human knowledge has covered too large an area, for some time past, for any one to imitate Bacon's audacity in taking it all for his province. When a man may spend a lifetime in investigating the peculiarities of certain breeds of microscopic animalcula, even scientific people must be content to learn from him what the nature of the creatures may be. Whatever path of inquiry we may choose to take up, we soon find it branching out into such an infinite number of byways that the most important question soon comes to be, not what we will learn, but what we will have unlearnt. Now in taking in these necessary supplies of second-hand information, there is an immense difference in the susceptibility of different people. Some men go through a hospital full of contagious diseases, as some cows have remained in a herd of plague-stricken animals, without showing any symptoms of the complaints. We have all agreed to accept that kind of knowledge which we class as scientific, without very much difficulty. If any new proposition comes with the authority of an established professor of the science, we accept it with the confidence with which a Roman Catholic might take the decision of the infallible Church. But when we come to the much larger portion of knowledge which has not yet passed into that stage, it meets with the most various receptions from different men. If one man sees a telegram containing some startling information, he instinctively says that it is a lie, without further examination. Another man, as instinctively, accepts it as an undoubted truth. Some people may pass their lives in an atmosphere of homœopathy, water-cure, and other newfangled heresies, and never feel an inclination to move from the recognized paths. Others can never perceive the remotest scent of a new doctrine upon any subject without being attracted to it as naturally as a steel-filing to a magnet. It is not uncommon to meet men who have passed years in being snatched by one quack from the hands of another, and becoming vegetarians, teetotallers, spiritualists, revivalists, and believers that all human evils are to be attributed to the use of salt, tobacco, or butcher's meat, just as the fit takes them.

Now either of these classes may become sceptics, in the sense of being disbelievers in the accepted creed of their time and country, with equal facility. The first class is that which undoubtedly supplies the most normal type of the thorough-going sceptic. If such a man has been educated so as to hold revealed religion as belonging to the class of unproved things, it will be very hard to inoculate him with it. The frame of mind into which he instinctively falls is that which is manifested in commercial matters by a profound conviction that he is not to be done. He looks upon the rest of mankind as forming a spontaneous conspiracy for trapping him into foolish expenditure or into degrading belief. And, however else he may be wanting to himself, he will not easily permit his opponents to triumph over his too great credulity. But then it is to be added that such a man is more likely to keep his incredulity to himself. His temper will be too cold for setting up as a martyr to infidelity; he will have too low an opinion of his neighbors to think them worth undeceiving, and will add another to the number of those who are induced to pass by all such questions with indifference. It is the other class which supplies the greatest number of conspicuous and credulous sceptics. The sanguine temperament to which the novelty of a belief is in itself a recommendation is the natural temperament of radicals and reformers. Such a man is an unbeliever, not because he dislikes belief, but because he dislikes holding the same creed as the common mass of people. It gives him positive pleasure to shock steady-going prejudices; but he is quite ready to take up any new doctrine before it has passed into the steady-going stage, and without thinking too carefully whether it will ever reach that stage or not. He will probably afford an easy triumph to the supporters of the orthodox faith, by engrafting upon his professed infidelity any new doctrine that comes in his way, however large a demand it may make upon his credulity. He is predisposed to catch the contagion; and it is of such materials that the greater part of the fanatical sects of the day are necessarily composed. But then such a man is merely, so to speak, a spurious sceptic; he has not a specific objection to believing, but the very contrary; and however much the aphorism we have quoted may gall him, it is generally a rather doubtful weapon against the more determined, though less conspicuous, unbelievers.

STOCK GAMBLING.

THE "CORNER" IN PRAIRIE DU CHIEN.

From the N. Y. Evening Post.

WALL street has lately been roused from its normal quiet by an operation which has cast far into the shade the far-famed Harlem "corner." The stock of the Milwaukee and Prairie du Chien Railway has risen from 65 to 250, and quite a number of "short" contracts still remain uncovered. Much over a million dollars has been made and lost in this stock within a week, and it is possible that before the outstanding contracts are settled, another million of dollars will change hands. Let us tell the story in detail.

First, as to the stock concerned. The railroad from Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to the Mississippi, 192 miles, with a branch from Milton to Monroe, 42 miles, in all 234 miles, was completed in 1857 by the Mississippi and Milwaukee railroad, at a cost of about $8,100,000, say $34,800 per mile—not an exorbitant price. Unfortunately for the company, the crisis of 1857 and the short crops of 1857 and 1858 prostrated the Western country; the Mississippi and Milwaukee Company could not pay the interest on its bonds, they were duly foreclosed, and the property passed into the hands of the Milwaukee and Prairie du Chien Railway Company, a corporation born of the ashes of the defunct concern. The new company was organized with an aggregate capital of about $7,200,000. It enjoyed the rare advantage of being well managed. It participated in the general development of the Western country. Its earnings thus grew from an average of a million, prior to 1860, $1,700,000 in 1864, and to nearly $2,000,000 in the current year —say 27 per cent. gross on the capital represented.

Under the articles of organization of the Milwaukee and Prairie du Chien Railway, the common stock could receive no dividends so long as the concern owed any funded debt. Hence, its value was always a matter of uncertainty. At the time the business of the Company began to revive, after the reorganization, 20 was considered a fair price; in the full heat of the speculation of 1864 90 was bid for 10,000 shares; and again, in the depression of the early months of 1865, it was offered at 29. At the beginning of October, 1865, it was selling at 60 and 65.

At this time it was apparent that within a short period, six to twelve months at most, the whole funded debt, amounting to less than half a million, would be paid off or converted into stock, and that the stock would, within six or twelve months, become dividend bearing. The prospects led, on the one hand, to considerable purchases, and on the other to some lively speculation for the fall. There are speculators in Wall street who are prepared to bet against anything. There were many who are willing to take the odds against there being any dividends on Prairie du Chien during the year 1866. These operators derived comfort from consultations with the Directors of the Board, who, having no interest in the common stock, and being exclusively concerned for the preferred stock and mortgage bonds, were quite prepared to pledge themselves that the common stockholders should not receive a dollar until, first, the debt had been extinguished; secondly, the preferred stock had been reduced; and, thirdly, the road and equipment had been brought into a high condition of repair and completeness. With such assurances the regular bears of Wall street began to sell freely the common stock of the Prairie du Chien for future delivery.

At this stage of the proceedings speculators interested in other roads began to put a finger in the pie. Two great railway companies, the Chicago and Northwestern, and the Milwaukee and St. Paul, are largely interested in the Prairie du Chien. Either of the two would make money by buying it out, if they could get it at its nominal cost, that is, at par for all its securities. The Chicago and Northwestern could afford to pay 150 for all the stock and bonds of the Prairie du Chien, if they could be sure of securing the whole. To what extent these companies took part in the "corner" we are about to describe, cannot yet be ascertained. But it may fairly be presumed that one or the other of them was at the bottom of the operation.

Suffice it, for the purposes of the present narrative to say that between 40 and 70, the whole or very nearly the whole—some persons say much more than the whole—of the common stock of the Prairie du Chien was bought by somebody. The purchases were made quietly, and the stock was freely lent out to any one who wanted to borrow it; more stock was tendered to parties who were supposed to be anxious to sell it for the fall; thus, when the price was 70 to 75, a large short interest had been created, and those in the secret had the satisfaction of holding not only all or nearly all the stock, but, besides, contracts for the delivery of several thousand shares which did not exist.

About the 1st of November the "corner" culminated. The stock rose suddenly from 70 to 80, next day from 80 to 90, next day from 90 to 100, next day from 100 to 200, next day from 200 to 250. Persons who had sold the stock short, and whose contracts were maturing; persons who had borrowed the stock for future delivery; persons who in any way or shape had rendered themselves responsible for the stock—were suddenly and startlingly brought face to face to the facts. The development was especially hard on commission brokers. A commission broker is considered to do a safe business when he exacts 25 per cent. from his customers. But when a stock rises 100 per cent. in a day, a margin of 25 per cent. is not much protection. During the first week of November quite a number of commission brokers were forced to settle with the party which had "cornered" the stock, at a loss of from one hundred to one hundred and fifty per cent., and others who declined to settle were forced to put up in the Trust companies such sums as actually impaired their capital. Two prominent houses were so weakened as to be compelled to suspend specie payment. On one hundred shares of stock sold short at 75 to 77 per cent., the loss at the present time is $12,500: on one thousand shares—and quite a number of speculators took a line of that amount—the loss is $125,000. It was confidently expected on the 5th that the "corner" would collapse within three days. But like the Harlem and Hudson "corners" it shows no signs of relaxing as yet.

There is no earthly reason, under the circumstances, why Prarie du Chien should not be put up to five hundred per cent. And if the short contracts are reduced or strengthened, so as to diminish the chances of failure on the part of the bears, the price will probably go to that figure. If, on the other hand, the shorts have generally covered their contracts, or if their condition is such that a further advance in the price would merely lead to more failurrs, it may be assumed that we have seen the highest figures.

WESTMINSTER ABBEY.

From the London Review.

LORD PALMERSTON lies in Westminster Abbey, and it may be reasonably supposed that before any length of time has elapsed a monument will be erected to his memory within the precincts of that venerable and sacred building. No doubt the design will be entrusted to Mr. Gibson, Mr. Theed, or one of our most eminent modern sculptors. It will be executed in white marble; it will include either a full-length statue or a bust of the departed statesman; it will, perhaps, be surrounded by a group of allegorical figures; it will probably bear a long and glowing panegyric on his character, and it will certainly be admired by nineteen people out of twenty as an imposing and dignified memorial. Indeed, it would be surprising if any exception were made to a rule which has been established on such ancient precedent. Long before Nelson shouted, "Victory or Westminster Abbey!" from the deck of the *San Josef* (albeit he was buried in St. Paul's), that noble relic of the middle ages had become a public mausoleum for the illustrious dead. Kings and statesmen, priests and warriors, poets, painters, pedagogues, and actors, each in turn have had their epitaphs or effigies in what the *Times* is pleased to call "our national Valhalla." If, through custom, we acquire a second nature, we may sometimes be said by the same means to establish a new order of taste. The English mind has been so long used to associate Poet's Corner with the hallowed memory of the Past that English eyes refuse to regard it in its true light—as an incongruous assemblage of ugly tablets. Our hearts swell with national pride in contemplating the monumental statues of Chatham and of Fox, of Wordsworth and of Garrick. We forget the questionable style of the monuments themselves, and the unquestionable impropriety of placing them in such a site. It is a melancholy fact, that for the last two centuries there has scarcely been a memorial group or figure erected in Westminster Abbey which is not either ugly in itself or of a design utterly out of keeping with the architecture by which it is surrounded. This was intelligible enough a hundred years ago, when the Abbey was indeed regarded as a Valhalla, and nothing else; when such sculptors as Stewart and Scheemakers thought they could improve its internal aspect by veneering it with their wretched inventions. Thus, in the noble transept, not far from the spot where our late Premier has just been laid, the graceful columns of the triforium were transformed into palm-trees, to enshrine the figure of a British admiral clothed in a Roman toga! Again, in the nave we have the apotheosis of another gallant naval officer, who is being rapt from marble waves into clouds of corresponding density, which adhere to a sky of slate. Even Nollekens saw the absurdity of this tribute to posthumous fame. "Admiral Tyrrell," said the old sculptor, "going to heaven out of the sea, looks for all the world as if he was hanging from a gallows with a rope round his neck." Those who have noticed the contortions of this figure will see some justice in the satire.

But what shall we say of the taste which in our own day permitted the burly figure of Charles James Fox to appear with naked shoulders reclining on a mattrass between Liberty and Peace, while an emancipated negro kneels in fervid gratitude (and nothing else) by the bedside? Compared with such glaring improprieties as these, Gibson's statue of Sir Robert Peel rises to the level of real dignity. Yet Peel in a *pallium* and hessian boots is an anomaly which will puzzle remote posterity not a little, when remote posterity turns its attention to the history of British costume. Such monuments as these would be hardly admissible in St. Paul's. In Westminster Abbey they are completely out of place. The cold white marble in which most of them are executed stands out harshly from the soft mellow grey of the Abbey stone. The size of the figures themselves, the bare and clumsy pedestals on which they are placed, the motive of their drapery—all are utterly opposed to the sombre and modest beauty of a Gothic "wall-veil." To realize the absurdity of the present system, we have only to imagine the bust of a deceased friend or relative removed from some private house to the aisle of our parish church. There are probably few members of any congregation who would not regard it as an impertinent intrusion. Now, Westminster Abbey is not only a church, but one of our most chaste and beautiful examples of old English architecture. It is intolerable to think that its charms are so often hid, and sometimes actually disfigured by such crude vulgarities as we have mentioned.

Two years ago, when a discussion arose in the House of Commons regarding the fees demanded by the (then) Dean and Chapter of Westminster for the admission of new monuments in the Abbey, Mr. Powell contended, with great reason, that some change was required in the condition of the Abbey, which Mr. Monckton Milnes, in the course of argument, seemed to regard more in the light of a national museum than a national church. He added that, in almost universal opinion, "no building dedicated to ecclesiastical purposes had been so degraded, in regard to monumental taste, by everything which aimed at beauty, but succeeded only in reaching the highest point of what was ugly and contemptible." His wish was not to increase the aggregation of monuments, but to remove some of them from the nave and aisles. "We have," continued Mr. Powell, "some monuments which are Hindoo, and some that are classical, but not one that is Christian." He concluded by expressing a hope that the Dean and Chapter would be firm in maintaining that the church over which they were constituted guardians was a building intended for the worship of God, in which congregations of Christian people were accustomed to meet for holy purposes, one generation after another, and not a mere hall in which an enormous mass of marble might be erected in every corner.

There is, no doubt, much that deserves consideration in these remarks. Westminster Abbey, viewed under certain aspects, does indeed seem to have degenerated into a "show" place. There is an element of jarring beadledom about it which is extremely offensive. It is true that the nave and cloisters are thrown open daily for public inspection, but all the east end of the church, including Edward the Confessor's Chapel and that built by Henry the Seventh, is closely guarded by a band of vergers as ignorant as they are officious, and as officious as they are uncivil. The charge of admission to this, by far the most interesting portion of the Abbey, is sixpence, which no one would begrudge if the endowments of Westminster are really insufficient to maintain proper servants for its custody. But having with that little silver key unlocked the grim iron gates (which are otherwise closed in your face) it is a little hard to be obliged to follow this purple-gowned *savant* wherever he goes, and at his own pace. For part of the ceremony consists in his describing to you with a dreary monotony (which no one who has not heard it can realize) the various beauties around him; and when a man has to do this every day, and half a dozen times a day, the process, besides being tiresome to himself, results in a perfunctoriness which is anything but agreeable to listeners. These *ciceroni* are, moreover, in the habit of assuming an air of extra-judicial authority peculiar to themselves. There is a story that, not many years ago, a party of foreigners were going over the Abbey, some of whom regarded the shrine of Edward the Confessor in a more venerable light than that of a sixpenny show. It is recorded of one of these gentlemen that he knelt at the shrine for a few moments in meditation. But this was a tax upon his patience which the verger could not permit. "There is no praying allowed in this part of the habby; you must move on!" he remonstrated. The idea of devotion in a church between the hours of one and three no doubt appeared to him preposterous—perhaps ungentlemanlike.

This anecdote is trifling, yet it may serve to illustrate our argument. There is an air of cold respectability and greedy vergerism about most of our English cathedrals. But St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey are singularly unfortunate in this respect. Except when the service is actually going on we forget that we are in a church. It would be difficult to say how much of this feeling is due to the obsequious garrulity of ignorant officials, how much to the petty worries of a sixpenny poll-tax, and how much to the pagan character of the monuments around us. But surely if the last be a reasonable cause of complaint, we need not add to the evil. In London there are plenty of important buildings devoted to public affairs where life-like busts and statues of departed greatness would be welcome and appropriate. In the busy haunts of this great city—whether frequented for work or pleasure—it might be well to bring before us the every-day aspect of those whose worldly career has been remarkable. But in a church we desire to think of the dead after a different fashion. We like to associate them with an idea of repose—to be reminded of the common faith which they shared with us, and of the future which it has promised. There are old-world tombs in Westminster Abbey—chaste specimens of ancient art—which, while they have commanded the admiration of Flaxman, seem to fulfil the higher conditions we have mentioned. Whether this type of monument could be adopted in the instance before us, we will not undertake to say, but we trust that none may be raised to the memory of Lord Palmerston without due regard for the site which it will occupy.

EDINBURGH DESCRIBED BY A POET.

LITERARY TRADITIONS.

ALEXANDER SMITH, the imaginative poet and graceful essayist, has written a new work in two volumes, entitled "A Summer in Skye." It has been published by Strahan, of London, and has attracted considerable attention. It is rich in vivid descriptions of natural scenery, the author beginning with this account—it might be called an attack—on the city of his residence, "High Dun-Edin," and its literary lights:

Throned on crags, Edinburgh takes every eye; and not content with supremacy in beauty, she claims an intellectual supremacy also. She is a patrician among British cities, "A penniless lass wi' a lang pedigree." She has wit if she lacks wealth; she counts great men against millionaires. The success of the actor is insecure until thereunto Edinburgh has set her seal. The poet trembles before the Edinburgh critics. The singer respects the delicacy of the Edinburgh ear. Coarse London may roar with applause; fastidious Edinburgh snubs disdain, and sneers reputations away. London is the stomach of the empire—Edinburgh the quick, subtle, far-darting brain. Some pretensions of this kind the visitor hears on all sides of him.

It is quite wonderful how Edinburgh purrs over her own literary achievements. Swift, in the dark years that preceded his death, looking one day over the productions of his prime, exclaimed, "Good heaven! what a genius I once was." Edinburgh, looking some fifty years back on herself, is perpetually expressing astonishment and delight. Mouldering Highland families, when they are unable to retain a sufficient following of servants, fill up the gaps with ghosts. Edinburgh maintains her dignity after a similar fashion, and for a similar reason. Lord Advocate Moncreiff, one of the members for the city, hardly ever addresses his fellow-citizens without recalling the names of Jeffrey, Cockburn, Rutherford, and the other stars that of yore made the welkin bright.

On every side we hear of the brilliant society of forty years ago. Edinburgh considers herself supreme in talent—just as it is taken for granted to-day that the present English navy is the most powerful in the world because Nelson won Trafalgar. The Whigs consider the *Edinburgh Review* the most wonderful effort of human genius. The Tories would agree with them if they were not bound to consider *Blackwood's Magazine* a still greater effort. It may be said that Burns, Scott, and Carlyle are the only men really great in literature—taking great in a European sense—who during the last eighty years have been connected with Edinburgh. I do not include Wilson in the list, for although he was as splendid as any of these for a moment, he was evanescent.

Scott lived in or near Edinburgh during the whole course of his life. Burns lived there but a few months. Carlyle went to London early, where he has written his important works and made his reputation. Let the city boast of Scott—no one will say she does wrong in that—but it is not so easy to discover the amazing brilliancy of her other literary lights. Their reputations, after all, are to a great extent local. What blazes a sun at Edinburgh would, if transported to London, not unfrequently become a farthing candle.

Lord Jeffrey—when shall we cease to hear his praises? With perfect truthfulness one may admit that His Lordship was no common man. His "vision" was sharp and clear enough within its range. He was unable to relish certain literary forms, as some men are unable to relish certain dishes—an inaptitude that might arise from fastidiousness of palate or from weakness of digestion. His style was perspicuous; he had an icy sparkle of epigram and antithesis, some wit, and no enthusiasm. He wrote many clever papers, made many clever speeches, said many clever things. But the man who could so egregiously blunder as to "Wilhelm Meister," who hooted Wordsworth through his entire career, who had the insolence to pen the sentence that opens the notice of the "Excursion" in the *Edinburgh Review*, and who, when, writing tardily, but really well, on Keats, could pass over the "Hyperion" with a slighting remark, might be possessed of distinguished parts, but no claim can be made for him to the character of a great critic.

Hazlitt, wilful, passionate, splendidly gifted, in whose very eccentricities and fierce vagaries there was a generosity which belongs only to fine natures, has sunk away into an almost unknown London grave, and his works into unmerited oblivion; while Lord Jeffrey yet makes radiant with his memory the city of his birth. In point of natural gifts and endowments—in point, too, of literary issue and result—the Englishman far surpassed the Scot. Why have their destinies been so different? One considerable reason is that Hazlitt lived in London—Jeffrey in Edinburgh. Hazlitt was partially lost in an impatient crowd and rush of talent. Jeffrey stood patent to every eye, in an open space, in which there were few competitors. London does not brag about Hazlitt—Edinburgh brags about Jeffrey.

LITTLE JOHNNY CLEM.—Of course you remember the story of little Johnny Clem, the motherless atom of a drummer boy, aged ten, who strayed away from Newark, Ohio; and the first we knew of him, though small enough to live in a drum, was beating the long roll for the 22d Michigan. At Chickamauga, he filled the office of "marker," carrying the guidon whereby they form the lines; a duty having its counterpart in the surveyor's more peaceful calling, in the flag-man who flutters the red signal along the metes and bounds. On the Sunday of the battle, the little fellow's occupation gone, he picked up a gun that had fallen from some dying hand, provided himself with ammunition, and began putting in the periods quite on his own account, blazing away close to the ground, like a fire-fly in the grass. Late in the waning day, the waif left almost alone in the whirl of the battle, a rebel Colonel dashed up, and looking down at him, ordered him to surrender: "Surrender!" he shouted, "you little d——d son of a——!" The words were hardly out of his mouth, when Johnny brought his piece to "order arms," and, as his hand slipped down to the hammer, he pressed it back, swung up the gun to the position of "charge bayonet," and as the officer raised his sabre to strike the piece aside, the glancing barre lifted into range, and the proud colonel tumbled from his horse, his lips fresh-stained with the syllable of vile reproach he had flung on a mother's grave in the hearing of her child! A few swift moments ticked on by musket-shots, and the tiny gunner was swept up by a rebel swoop and borne away a prisoner. Soldiers, bigger but not better, were taken with him only to be washed back again by a surge of Federal troopers, and the prisoner of thirty minutes was again John Clem "of ours;" and Gen. Rosecrans made him a sergeant, and the stripes of rank covered him all over like a mouse in a harness; and the daughter of Mr. Secretary Chase presented him a silver medal, appropriately inscribed, which he worthily wears, a royal order of honor upon his left breast; and all men conspire to spoil him; but, since few ladies can get at him here, perhaps he may be saved.

Well, like Flora McFlimsy, the sergeant "had nothing to wear;" the clothing in the wardrobe of loyal livery was not at all like Desdemona's handkerchief, "too little," but like the garments of the man who roomed a month over a baker's oven, "a world too wide;" and so Miss Babcock, of the Sanitary Commission, suggested that a uniform for the little orderly would be acceptable. Mr. Waite and other gentlemen of the "Sherman House" ordered it, Messrs. A. D. Titsworth & Company made it, Chaplain Raymond brought it, Miss Babcock presented it, and Johnny put it on. Chaplain Raymond of the 51st Illinois—by the by, a most earnest and efficient officer—accompanied the gift with exceedingly appropriate suggestions and advice. I happened at headquarters just as the belted and armed sergeant was booted and spurred and ready to ride. Resplendent in his elegant uniform, rigged *cap-a-pie*, modest, frank, with a clear eye and a manly face, he looked more like a fancy picture than a living thing. Said he to the chaplain: "You captured me by surprise, yesterday." Now, he is "going on" thirteen, as our grandmothers used to say; but he would be no monster if we called him only nine. Think of a sixty-three pound sergeant—fancy a handful of a hero, and then read the Arabian Nights, and believe them. Long live the little orderly!—*Rebellion Record.*

ENGLISH LEAVE-TAKING.—The taking-leave of an English family is as interesting and instructive as the reception, of which I spoke in a previous letter. All is quiet as if you were coming back to dinner. When you announce your determination to depart, it is supposed that you know what you are about, and have good reasons for your movements. Instead, therefore, of undergoing a cross-examination by the family in general, concerning said reasons and future plans, you are simply wished a pleasant, prosperous journey, and are cordially invited, once